THE WORKS OF M. DE VOLTAIRE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

WITH

NOTES, HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL.

BY T. SMOLLETT, M. D.

T. FRANCKLIN, M. A. AND OTHERS.

IN TWENTY-FOUR VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

THE FOURTH EDITION.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE
AU 17
1912

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY R. MARCHBANK,

FOR R. MONCRIEFFE IN CAPEL-STREET.

M, DCC, LXXII.

12-53

ADVERTISEMENT.

MR. de VOLTAIRE is one of the few happy authors who have lived to enjoy the full fruits of the moſt extenſive reputation. He has lived to ſee his fame flouriſhing not only in his own country, but alſo diffuſed over all the civilized kingdoms and ſtates of Europe; among which he is univerſally admired for the fire of his genius, the brilliancy of his wit, the poignancy of his ſatire, the elegance of his ſtyle: in a word, for that nameleſs talent which operates like a charm, engaging the reader's attention and applauſe, even in ſpite of himſelf, and as it were rendering the performance inchanting alike to perſons of every age, nation, character, and complexion.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
AU 17
1912
CAMBRIDGE

But

But how much ſoever he may be admired in other countries, he ſeems to be peculiarly adapted by nature, for the entertainment of the Engliſh people, diſtinguiſhed as he is by that impetuoſity of genius, that luxuriancy of imagination and freedom of ſpirit, which have characterized the moſt eminent poets of the Britiſh nation.

This congenial affinity remarkably appears in that eagerneſs with which his works are procured, tranſlated, and peruſed by the natives of Great Britain: an impatience attended with ſome inconvenience, which it is our purpoſe to remove.

The works of M. de VOLTAIRE having made their firſt appearance in detached pieces, were partly tranſlated into the Engliſh language ſeparately by different hands, with very different degrees of merit, publiſhed in various parcels, according to the reſpective ſchemes and abilities of the different editors and tranſlators, who ſelected from the whole ſuch pieces only as they imagined would beſt ſuit their particular purpoſes. Thus the tranſ-

lation

lation of VOLTAIRE's works hath been left incomplete with reſpect to the general plan, as well as irregular in regard to the printing and paper, the ſize and execution of the ſeparate volumes.

It may alſo be pronounced defective in another ſenſe. Our author's imagination is ſo warm and impetuous, that it often tranſports him from image to image, and from ſentiment to ſentiment, with ſuch rapidity as obliges him to leave the picture half diſcloſed, and the connexion unexplained. In his proſe-writings he uſually burſts into the ſubject, and throws a glare of light on ſome particular part, as if he took it for granted that the reader had before conſidered it in every other attitude and point of view. This velocity of impulſe, added to a remarkable paſſion for peculiarity in point of ſentiment, hath hurried him into ſome obſcurities, inadvertencies, and errors, eſpecially in the execution of his hiſtorical tracts, which of all his works

are the moſt univerſally read for entertainment and inſtruction.

In order, therefore, to do juſtice to his merit, and at the ſame time ſupply his defects, we have publiſhed a complete and regular tranſlation of all his works, (in TWENTY-FOUR VOLUMES) illuſtrated with notes, hiſtorical and critical, which will correct his miſtakes, elucidate his obſcurities, point out his beauties, and explain his alluſions, to the ſatisfaction of the public.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

INTRODUCTION.

Containing the plan of the Work, with a ſummary account of what the Weſtern Nations originally were, and the author's reaſons for beginning this eſſay with a deſcription of the Eaſt 1

CHAP. I.

Of China; its antiquity, ſtrength, and laws 9

CHAP. II.

Of the Religion of China; demonſtrating that the government is not atheiſtical; that Chriſtianity was not preached among the Chineſe in the ſeventh century; and giving an account of ſome ſects eſtabliſhed in that country 19

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Indies 25

CHAP. IV.

Of Perſia, Arabia, and Mahomet 28

CHAP. V.

Of Italy and the Church before the time of Charlemagne 45

CHAP. VI.

Source of the Papal Power 59

CHAP. VII.

State of the Eaſtern Church before Charlemagne 64

CHAP. VIII.

Of Charlemagne 69

CHAP. IX.

Of Charlemagne, when raiſed to the Imperial Throne 75

CHAP. X.

Manners and Cuſtoms that prevailed about the time of Charlemagne 83

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Laws and Cuſtoms that prevailed in the reign of Charlemagne 87

CHAP. XII.

Of the prevailing Religion in the Age of Charlemagne 94

CHAP. XIII.

Sequel of the Cuſtoms that prevailed in the time of Charlemagne. Of Juſtice; of the Laws; of particular Cuſtoms 107

CHAP. XIV.

Of Lewis the Feeble, or the Debonnaire 112

CHAP. XV.

Of the ſtate of Europe, after the death of Lewis the Debonnaire, or the Feeble 120

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Romans towards the ninth century 127

CHAP. XVII.

Of England towards the ninth century 134

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Spain and the Muſſulmans towards the eighth and ninth centuries. 137

CHAP. XIX.

Of the empire of Conſtantinople in the eighth and ninth centuries 146

CHAP. XX.

Of Italy and the popes, together with the divorce of Lotharius king of Lorrain, and other affairs relating to the Church, in the eighth and ninth centuries 152

CHAP. XXI.

Of Photius and the ſchiſm between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches 157

CHAP. XXII.

The ſtate of the Weſtern Empire towards the end of the ninth century 163

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the German Empire and its Fiefs 166

CHAP. XXIV.

Of Otho the Great in the tenth century 168

CHAP. XXV.

Of the Papacy in the tenth century, before Otho the Great made himſelf maſter of Rome

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

Continuation of the reign of Otho, and of the State of Italy 174

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the emperors Otho II. and III. and of Rome 178

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of France, in the time of Hugh Capet 182

CHAP. XXIX.

The ſtate of France in the tenth and eleventh centuries 187

CHAP. XXX.

The conqueſt of Naples and Sicily, by a few Norman Gentlemen. 191

CHAP. XXXI.

Of Sicily in particular, and of the right of legation in that iſland 199

CHAP. XXXII.

The Conqueſt of England by William Duke of Normandy 203

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of the ſtate of Europe in the tenth and eleventh centuries 209

CHAP XXXIV.

Of Spain and the Moors. The ſtate of that kingdom till the beginning of the twelfth century 213

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXV.

Of Religion and Superſtition in the tenth and eleventh centuries 220

CHAP. XXXVI.

Of the Empire. Of Italy. Of the emperor Henry IV. and pope Gregory VII. Of Rome and the Empire in the eleventh century. 227

CHAP. XXXVII.

Of the emperor Henry V. and of Rome, 'till the time of Frederic I. called Barbaroſſa. 240

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Of Frederic Barbaroſſa 245

CHAP. XXXIX.

Of the emperor Henry VI. and of Rome. 252

CHAP. XL.

The State of France and England, 'till the reigns of St. Lewis, John Lackland, and Henry III. during the twelfth century. Great changes in the public adminiſtration in England and France. The murder of Thomas Becket, archbiſhop of Canterbury: England made a fief to the ſee of Rome, &c. 256

CHAP. XLI.

Of Otho IV. and Philip Auguſtus in the thirteenth century. Of the battle of Bouvines, and of England and France, till the death of Lewis VIII. father to St. Lewis 268

THE

INTRODUCTION.

CONTAINING,

The PLAN of the WORK;

WITH

A Summary Account of what the Weſtern Nations originally were, and the Author's Reaſons for beginning this Eſſay with a Deſcription of the EAST.

YOU are at length reſolved, then, to ſurmount the diſguſt you conceived from reading the Modern Hiſtory, ſince the decay of the Roman Empire, and to receive a general idea of the nations which inhabit and ravage the face of the earth. All that you ſeek to learn in this immenſity of matter, is only that which deſerves to be known; the genius, the manners and cuſtoms of the principal nations, ſupported by facts, of which no intelligent perſon ſhould be ignorant. The aim of ſuch an inquiry is not to know the preciſe year in which the brutal ſovereign of a barbarous people was ſucceeded by a prince unworthy of hiſtorical notice. If a man could have the misfortune to incumber his head with the chronological ſeries of all the dynaſties which have ſubſiſted, all his knowledge would be a jumble of words. As it is laudable to know the great actions of thoſe ſovereigns who have improved their ſubjects, and rendered them more happy; ſo it is reaſonable to remain in ignorance of vulgar events in reigns, which ſerve only to burden the memory. What advantage can you derive from the minute detail of a

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE AU 17 1912

number of petty intereſts and connexions which no longer ſubſiſt? of families long extinct, that conteſted the poſſeſſion of provinces now ſwallowed up in mighty kingdoms? Every individual city now boaſts its own particular hiſtory, whether true or falſe, more voluminous and circumſtantial than that of Alexander the Great. There is more writing in the archives of a ſingle convent, than in the annals of the Roman empire.

A reader muſt confine himſelf to certain limits, and ſelect only the choice parts from thoſe immenſe collections which the ſtudy of one perſon cannot poſſibly comprehend. They conſtitute a vaſt magazine, from whence you take what is neceſſary for your own occaſions.

The illuſtrious Boſſuet, who in his treatiſe on one part of Univerſal Hiſtory diſplays the true ſpirit of an hiſtorian, has left off at the reign of Charlemagne. Your deſign is, by beginning with this æra, to form to yourſelf a picture of mankind: but, you muſt often trace back your inquiry to times of greater antiquity. That great writer, in briefly mentioning the Arabians, who founded ſuch a mighty empire, and eſtabliſhed ſuch a flouriſhing religion, ſpeaks of them as a deluge of barbarians. He expatiates indeed on the Egyptians; but wholly ſuppreſſes the Indians and Chineſe, at leaſt as antient and conſiderable as the people of Egypt.

Regaled as we are by the produce of their country, cloathed with their ſtuffs, amuſed by the games which they invented, nay even inſtructed by the morality of their antient fables, why ſhould we neglect to learn the genius of thoſe nations which our European traders have conſtantly viſited, ever ſince they firſt found out the way to their coaſts *?

In

* To the natives of India we are indebted for the benefits of agriculture, the manufactures of ſilk, the game at cheſs, and the fables of Pilpay.

In your philoſophical inquiries touching the concerns of this globe, you naturally direct your firſt attention to the Eaſt, the nurſery of the arts, to which the weſtern world owes every thing which it now enjoys. The oriental and ſouthern climes inherit every advantage immediately from nature; whereas we, in theſe northern regions, owe all to time, to commerce, and to tedious induſtry.

The countries antiently poſſeſſed by the Celtæ, Allobroges, Picts, Germans, Sarmatians, and Scythians, produced nothing but wild fruits, rocks, and foreſts. Sicily, indeed, is ſaid to have afforded a ſmall quantity of oats; but as for wheat, rice, and the fruits of delicate taſte and flavour, they grew on the borders of the Euphrates, in China, and in India. The moſt fertile countries were firſt inhabited, and their inhabitants firſt regulated by police. The whole Levant, from Greece even to the extremities of our hemiſphere *, was famous in hiſtory even long before we knew ſo much of it as to be ſenſible of our own barbarity. If we want to know any thing of our anceſtors, the Celtæ, we muſt have recourſe to the Greeks and Romans, nations of a much later date than thoſe who inhabit the continent of Aſia.

For example: Though the Gauls bordering upon the Alps, in conjunction with the inhabitants of theſe mountains, ſettled on the banks of the Po, from whence they penetrated to Rome about three hundred and ſixty years after the foundation of that city, and even beſieged the capitol; we ſhould never have known of this expedition, but for the Roman hiſtorians. Though another ſwarm of the ſame people, about one hundred years after this enterprize, invaded Theſſaly and Macedonia, and advanced to the coaſt of the Euxine-ſea: all the information

* What our author means by the extremity of our hemiſphere we cannot comprehend: if he means the northern parts of Europe, ſurely he has miſapplied the word Levant, which cannot be with any propriety extended farther northwards than the countries bordering on the Mediterranean.

mation we have of this adventure, is from the Greeks; and they have neither told us who thoſe Gauls were, nor what route they followed. In our own country there is not the leaſt memorial of theſe migrations, in which our forefathers reſembled the Tartars: they only prove that we were a numerous and uncivilized people. The Grecian colony that founded Marſeilles ſix hundred years before the Chriſtian æra, found it impracticable to poliſh the Gauls: the Greek language did not extend beyond their own territory. Neither Gauls, Germans, Spaniards, Britons, nor Sarmatians, know any thing of their own anceſtors, that happened above eighteen centuries ago, except the little they learn from the records of their conquerors. We are even deſtitute of fables, as if we had not courage to invent an origin: for thoſe vain conceits importing that all the Weſt was peopled by Gomer the ſon of Japhet, are fictions of the Eaſt. If the antient Tuſcans, who inſtructed the firſt inhabitants of Rome, knew ſomething more than the other nations of the Weſt, they either owed that knowledge to the Greek colonies that ſettled among them, or it was the peculiar property of that ſoil to produce men of genius; as the territory of Athens was more fruitful of the arts than were thoſe of Thebes and Lacedemon. But, after all, what monuments have we now remaining of antient Tuſcany? None at all. We exhauſt ourſelves in vague conjectures on ſome * unintelligible inſcriptions which have eſcaped the injuries of time. As for the other nations of Europe, not one inſcription remains in any language which they antiently uſed.

The coaſt of Spain was diſcovered by the Phœnicians, as the Spaniards have ſince diſcovered America. The Tyrians, the Carthaginians, and the Romans, were in their turns enriched by the treaſures of the earth, which that country produced. The Carthaginians found their advantage

* All the Tuſcan inſcriptions are not unintelligible. The alphabet uſed by that antient people is aſcertained, and ſeveral inſcriptions have been clearly explained by the antiquaries of Italy and England.

advantage in mines as rich as thoſe of Mexico and Peru; mines which time hath exhauſted *, as it will exhauſt the treaſures of the new world. Pliny gives us to underſtand, that the Romans, in the ſpace of nine years, drew from thence eight thouſand marks of gold, and about twenty thouſand of ſilver. It muſt be owned, that thoſe pretended deſcendants of Gomer made a very bad uſe of the various advantages which their country produced, ſeeing they were ſucceſſively ſubdued by the Carthaginians, the Romans, the Goths, the Vandals, and the Arabians.

What we learn of the Gauls from Julius Cæſar and other Roman authors, gives us the idea of a people that ſtood in need of being ſubdued by a civilized nation. The dialects of the Celtic language were altogether frightful. The emperor Julian, in whoſe reign it was ſtill ſpoken, ſays it reſembled the croaking of ravens. In Cæſar's time, their language was not more barbarous than their manners. Their druids, a ſet of the greateſt impoſtors, though well enough adapted to the people whom they governed, uſed to ſacrifice human victims, whom they burned in large and hideous wicker ſtatues. The female druids plunged their knives into the hearts of the priſoners, and predicted future events from the flowing of the blood. The vaſt ſtones which appear a little hollowed on the confines of Gaul and Germany, are ſaid to be the altars on which thoſe ſacrifices were offered. Theſe are the only monuments of antient Gaul. Thoſe who inhabited the coaſts of Biſcay and Gaſcony, ſometimes fed on human fleſh. We muſt turn our eyes with horror from the contemplation of thoſe ſavage times, which are indeed a diſgrace to human nature.

Let us reckon, among the extravagancies of the human imagination, the notion entertained in our days,

* The ſilver mines of Spain are far from being exhauſted. There are ſome in the province of Eſtremadura, that yield plenty of ore, much richer than any that ever was brought from America.

that the Celtæ were deſcended from the Hebrews. They ſacrificed their own ſpecies, (ſay thoſe viſionaries) becauſe Jephtha ſacrificed his daughter. The druids were clad in white, in imitation of the Jewiſh prieſts: like theſe, they had a high-prieſt; and the female druids were repreſentatives of Moſes's ſiſter and Deborah. The poor wretch pampered at Marſeilles, and offered as a ſacrifice, crowned with flowers, and loaded with curſes, was in alluſion to the ſcape-goat. They go ſo far as to find ſome reſemblance between a few Celtic and Hebrew words, equally ill pronounced; and thence conclude that the Jews and the Celtæ are of the ſame family. Thus reaſon is inſulted in our Univerſal Hiſtories, and the little knowledge we might have of antiquity ſtifled under a heap of overſtrained conjectures.

The Germans nearly reſembled the Gauls in their morals: like them they ſacrificed human victims: like them they decided their private diſputes by ſingle combat: the only difference was, that the Germans were more ſimple and leſs induſtrious than their neighbours. Their families lived in wretched cottages, at one end of which the father, mother, ſiſters, brothers, and children, lay huddled together, naked, upon ſtraw; while the other end was reſerved for their cattle. Theſe, however, are the ſame people whom we ſhall ſoon ſee in poſſeſſion of Rome!

When Cæſar invaded Britain, he found that iſland ſtill more ſavage than Germany: the natives were ſcarcely at the trouble to conceal their nakedneſs with ſkins: the women belonging in common to all the men of the ſame diſtrict. They had no other habitations than willow cabins: and the ornaments of both ſexes were figures painted on their bodies, by pricking the ſkin, and pouring in the juice of herbs; an art ſtill practiſed by the Indians in America.

That human nature was for a long ſeries of ages plunged in this ſtate ſo nearly reſembling that of the brute creation, and even inferior to it in many reſpects, is a truth

truth but too well confirmed. The reaſon is this: it is not in the nature of man to deſire what he does not know. He required not only a prodigious ſpace of time, but alſo a number of lucky circumſtances for raiſing himſelf above the level of meer animal life.

You have therefore great reaſon for reſolving to make one ſtride to thoſe nations which were firſt civilized. Long before the empires of China and India commenced, perhaps the world produced nations that were knowing, poliſhed, and powerful; and theſe were, perhaps, in the ſequel, plunged again, by deluges of barbarians, into that original ignorance and brutality which is called the ſtate of nature.

The ſack of Conſtantinople was alone ſufficient to annihilate the ſpirit of antient Greece. The Goths deſtroyed the genius of the Romans. The coaſt of Africa, heretofore ſo rich and flouriſhing, is nothing now but the haunt of pyrates and banditti. Changes ſtill more extraordinary muſt have happened in leſs favourable climates. Phyſical and moral cauſes muſt have conjoined; for although the ocean cannot have entirely changed its bed, certain it is, vaſt tracts of lands have been by turns overflowed and forſaken by the ſea. Nature muſt have been expoſed to many plagues and viciſſitudes: revolutions muſt have been frequent; though we are ignorant of theſe events. With reſpect to us, mankind is a new ſpecies.

Beſides, you begin your enquiries at the time when the chaos of Europe begins to aſſume a form after the fall of the Roman empire. Let us then make the tour of this globe together: let us ſee the condition in which it then was, by ſurveying it in the ſame manner as it ſeems to have been civilized; that is, from the eaſtern countries to theſe weſtern climes: and let us direct our firſt attention to a people who had a regular hiſtory, written in a language already fixed, at a time when we knew not the uſe of letters.

ANTIENT AND MODERN HISTORY.

CHAP. I.

OF CHINA.

Its ANTIQUITY, STRENGTH, and LAWS.

THE empire of China was even then more extenſive than that of Charlemagne, eſpecially if we reckon Corea and Tonquin, provinces at that time tributary to the Chineſe. It extended thirty degrees in longitude, and four and twenty in latitude. The body of this empire has ſubſiſted above four thouſand years, without having undergone any ſenſible alteration in its laws, cuſtoms, language, or even its faſhion of apparel.

Its hiſtory, which is inconteſtible, as being the only records that are founded upon obſervations of the heavens, is traced back by the ſureſt chronology, to an eclipſe calculated two thouſand one hundred and fifty-five years before our vulgar æra, and verified by the mathematicians belonging to the different miſſions, who having been ſent in theſe laſt centuries to that unknown people, have at once admired and inſtructed them. Fa-

ther Gaubil examined a ſucceſſion of ſix and thirty ſolar eclipſes recorded in the books of Confucius, and found but two of them doubtful, and two erroneous.

True it is, Alexander ſent from Babylon into Greece, the obſervations of the Chaldeans, aſcending four hundred years higher than thoſe of the Chineſe; and this is without contradiction, the faireſt monument of antiquity; but theſe ephemerides of Babylon were not connected with the hiſtory of events: on the contrary, the Chineſe have joined the hiſtory of the heavens to that of the earth, ſo as to confirm the one by the other. Two hundred and thirty years above the period of that eclipſe which we have mentioned, their chronology reaches without interruption, and is confirmed with proofs which they deem authentic, as far as the emperor Hiao, who laboured himſelf in reforming aſtronomy; and who, through the whole courſe of a reign that laſted eighty years, continued his endeavours to enlighten and befriend mankind. In China his name is ſtill held in the utmoſt veneration, like thoſe of Titus, Trajan, and Antoninus, in the annals of Europe. That he was for that time an able mathematician, proves only he was born in a civilized nation. We do not find that the antient magiſtrates amongſt the Germans or the Gauls, made any progreſs in reforming aſtronomy. Clovis himſelf had no ſuch convenience as an obſervatory.

We find ſix kings preceding the time of Hiao, though the length of their reſpective reigns is not certainly known. In this ſilence of chronology, I think we cannot do better than have recourſe to the rule of Sir Iſaac Newton, who having compared the number of years, during which the kings of the earth ſwayed the ſceptre in different countries, reduces each reign to two and twenty years, at an average. According to this computation, which ſeems the more reaſonable, as it is moderate, thoſe ſix monarchs muſt have reigned about one hundred and thirty years: and this ſuppoſition is more conformable to the order of nature, than that of two hundred and forty years, for example, aſſigned to the ſeven kings of Rome, as well as ſo many other calcula-

tions,

tions, which have been refuted by the experience of all ages.

The firſt of theſe kings, then, whoſe name was Fohi, reigned at leaſt five and twenty centuries before the Chriſtian æra, at a time when the Babylonians had already collected a ſucceſſion of aſtronomical obſervations; and even then, China was ſubject to one ſovereign. Its fifteen kingdoms, united under one prince, clearly prove, that, long before this period, the country was well inhabited, regulated by laws, and divided into a number of ſovereignties; for a mighty nation is never formed but of a number of ſmall ſtates: it is the work of policy, courage, and eſpecially of time: there cannot be a more convincing mark of antiquity.

True it is, the tyrant Hoangti * ordered all the books of the empire to be burned; but this very ſtupid and barbarous decree ſerved as a caution to the people to preſerve them carefully; and accordingly they appeared after his death. After all, it is of very little conſequence to know whether the chronology contained in thoſe books may be always depended upon. Suppoſe we did not know preciſely the time in which Charlemagne flouriſhed; as we are certain that he made vaſt conqueſts with mighty armies, it clearly follows that he was born in a numerous nation, formed in a body, and incorporated in the courſe of a long ſucceſſion of ages. Since the emperor Hiao, therefore, who doubtleſs lived about two thouſand four hundred years before our common æra, conquered the whole country of Corea, it is beyond all queſtion, that his people were reformed even from the remoteſt antiquity †. The

* Hoamti or Hoangti, according to Gemelli, invented muſic and muſical inſtruments, arms, nets, carts, ſhips, and carpenter's work; he compoſed ſeveral books of medicine, and his queen brought into vogue the culture of ſilk-worms, with the arts of dying and weaving the ſilk.

† This is an inference which will by no means be allowed. We can eaſy conceive how a prince ſhould erect an empire compoſed of different nations, and then add a neighbouring country to his new dominions. Hiſtory affords many inſtances of this nature. Charlemagne himſelf formed the empire of the Weſt, by uniting different nations, and then ſubdued the Saxons. The Turks, a barbarous

The increaſe of the human ſpecies is not ſo quick as it is generally imagined. One third part of the children die under ten years of age. Thoſe who have calculated the propagation of mankind, obſerve, that with very favourable circumſtances, a nation will hardly gain a twentieth part in the ſpace of one century; and very often the number of people is rather diminiſhed than increaſed. This is another proof of the antiquity of China. In the reign of Charlemagne, and long before that period, it was ſtill more populous than extenſive. The laſt computation we know, and that was confined to the fifteen provinces which compoſe China, properly ſo called, amounted to near ſixty millions of fencible men; without including veteran ſoldiers, old men above ſixty, young men under twenty, the mandarins, the multitude of learned perſons, or the bonzes: much leſs the women, who are every where in proportion to the other ſex, nearly as fourteen to fifteen, according to the obſervation of thoſe who have made the moſt exact calculations touching the human ſpecies. At this rate, we can hardly ſuppoſe there are fewer than one hundred and fifty millions of inhabitants in China. Europe contains little more than a hundred millions, reckoning twenty in France, two and twenty in Germany, four in Hungary, ten in the whole extent of Italy, as far as Dalmatia, eight in Great-Britain and Ireland, eight in Spain and Portugal, ten in European Ruſſia, ſix in Poland, as many in Turky within Europe, Greece, and the iſlands, four in Sweden, three in Norway and Denmark, and about that number in Holland and the Low-Countries. We muſt not, therefore, be ſurprized at the immenſity of the Chineſe cities; that Pekin, the new capital of the empire, ſhould be nearly ſix leagues in circumference, and contain about four millions of people; and there was formerly a ſtill greater number in Nanquin the antient metropolis; or that a million of inhabitants ſhould

barous people, founded their empire on the ruins of the Greek empire, and afterwards annexed Arabia to their dominions.

ſhould live in one village called Quientzeng, where the porcelain is manufactured *.

The forces of this empire, according to the relations of the moſt intelligent travellers, conſiſt of a ſtanding army amounting to eight hundred thouſand men well paid: five hundred and ſeventy thouſand horſes are maintained, either in the ſtables or paſture-grounds belonging to the emperor, for the cavalry in war, the journies of the court, and the uſe of public couriers. Several miſſionaries, whom the emperor Canghi, in theſe latter times, from the love of ſcience, allowed to approach his perſon, relate that they have attended him in thoſe magnificent hunting excurſions into Great Tartary, when one hundred thouſand horſemen, and ſixty thouſand infantry marched along in order of battle. This is a cuſtom immemorial in thoſe countries.

The Chineſe cities never had any other fortifications than ſuch as common ſenſe dictated to all nations, before the uſe of artillery, namely, a ditch, rampart, and ſtrong wall with turrets: even ſince the Chineſe began to uſe cannon, they have not imitated the Europeans in the ſtructure of their fortified places. Other nations have fortified towns: the Chineſe have fortified their whole empire. The great wall that ſeparates and divides China from the Tartars, built one hundred and thirty-ſeven years before Chriſt, ſtill remains through an extent of five hundred leagues, riſing to the tops of mountains, deſcending over precipices, being almoſt every-where twenty feet in thickneſs, and above thirty feet high †. A monument ſuperior to the pyramids of Ægypt, both in uſefulneſs and immenſity. This bulwark, however, could not hinder the Tartars, in the ſequel, from taking advantage

* Kiamim or Nankin is above ſix and thirty Italian miles in compaſs, without reckoning the ſuburbs, which are nearly as extenſive, or a floating town upon the canals. The whole together was ſaid to contain above thirty millions of ſouls; but this account has been found to be greatly exaggerated.

† It is built of large burned bricks, and a few ſtones, upon it. Through its whole extent, are large, ſtrong, ſquare towers, at the diſtance of two bow-ſhots from one another. This wall is continued half a league into the ſea.

advantage of the inteſtine troubles of China, ſo as to ſubdue the empire. But the conſtitution of it was neither weakened nor changed: the country of the conquerors became part of the empire they had ſubdued; and the Mantchoux Tartars, who are now maſters of China, have only ſubmitted ſword in hand to the laws of the country they invaded *.

The ordinary revenue of the emperor, according to the moſt probable calculations, amounts to two hundred millions of ounces of ſilver †. It muſt be obſerved, that the ounce of ſilver is not intrinſically worth one hundred ſols, as the hiſtory of China aſſerts: for there is no ſuch thing as intrinſic value in coin: but, rating our ſilver mark at fifty livres, the ſum will amount to twelve hundred and fifty millions of French money, as it ſtood in the year one thouſand ſeven hundred and forty; I ſay at this time, becauſe the arbitrary value of money has changed but too often in this kingdom; and perhaps will change again. This is a circumſtance not ſufficiently conſidered by writers, who, being more converſant in books than with buſineſs, are often very erroneous in their valuation of foreign money. The Chineſe had gold and ſilver coin long before the dariques were coined in Perſia. The emperor Canghi collected a ſucceſſion of three thouſand different coins, among which were ſeveral Indian pieces; another proof of the antiquity of the arts in Aſia: but, for a long time, gold has been diſuſed as current coin in China; and is now become a commodity, as in Holland. Silver no longer paſſes current, but is ſold according to its weight and ſtandard:

* The laſt emperor of the Chineſe race hanged himſelf in his own garden, that he might not fall alive into the hands of Li, a captain of banditti, who had made himſelf maſter of the imperial city. The general of the deceaſed emperor ſollicited the aſſiſtance of the Tartar prince againſt this uſurper, who was defeated. The auxiliary died before peace could be eſtabliſhed: but his followers refuſed to return to their own country, ſaying, the empire was due to their valour. They took poſſeſſion of Peking in the year 1643, and raiſed the infant ſon of their deceaſed prince to the throne of China.

† About fifty-five millions ſterling; reckoning one ounce of ſilver worth five ſhillings and ſixpence.

ſtandard: copper is the only coin that maintains an arbitrary value in this country. The goverment, in hard times, payed in paper; an expedient ſince uſed in more than one ſtate of Europe; but the Chineſe never made uſe of public banks, which augment the riches of a nation by multiplying its credit.

This country, the favourite of nature, poſſeſſes almoſt all the fruits which have been tranſplanted into Europe, and many others, which we do not enjoy. Their lands are covered with corn, rice, vines, pulſe, and trees of every kind; but the natives never make wine, being ſatisfied with a kind of liquor which they extract from rice. Thoſe precious inſects which produce ſilk are natives of China, from whence they were conveyed not a great while ago to Perſia, together with the art of making ſtuffs of the down that covers them. Theſe ſtuffs were ſo rare, that even in the days of Juſtinian, ſilk was ſold in Europe for its weight in gold. Fine paper of a ſhining white has been made by the Chineſe from time immemorial, with the fibres of bamboo cane boiled in water. We are ignorant of the æra at which they began to manufacture porcelain, and that fine varniſh which the Europeans begin to imitate with ſuch ſucceſs. They have, for theſe two thouſand years, known the art of making glaſs, though not in ſuch perfection as it has attained in Europe. About the ſame time they invented the art of printing: this, we know, is the method of engraving letters on boards of wood, as firſt practiſed by * Guttemberg at Mentz, in the fifteenth

* John Guttemberg finding it difficult to execute alone the idea he had conceived, aſſociated himſelf with John Fauſt, a rich burgher of the ſame city; and theſe, with the aſſiſtance of Peter Scheoffer, who was Fauſt's menial ſervant, and afterwads his ſon-in-law, actually executed their deſign, in the year one thouſand four hundred and fifty. Scheoffer afterwards invented the method of founding moveable types. The honour of this great diſcovery of printing is conteſted between the cities of Haarlem and Straſburg, in favour of Lawrence Coſter and John Mentel. It is pretended, that this laſt employed as an under-ſtrapper one Gensfleich, who betrayed him, and revealed the ſecret to John Guttemberg, at that time a goldſmith in Straſburg. But theſe allegations are not well ſupported: and Guttemberg is generally eſteemed as the original inventor.

teenth century. It is brought to greater perfection in China, where they have not yet adopted our method of uſing moveable types of caſt metal, though greatly ſuperior to theirs; ſo much are they attached to their old cuſtoms. The uſe of bells, among the Chineſe, is of greater antiquity. They have made ſome progreſs in chemiſtry; and, without becoming good naturaliſts, invented gun-powder, though they made no uſe of it, but at feſtivals, in fire-works, an art in which they ſurpaſſed all other nations. The Portugueſe, in theſe latter ages, taught them the uſe of artillery; and they learned the art of caſting cannon from the Jeſuits. Though the Chineſe did not exerciſe their talents in the invention of thoſe deſtructive inſtruments, they deſerve no praiſe from that circumſtance, as they have maintained wars notwithſtanding. They made no farther progreſs in aſtronomy, than as it is the ſcience of the eyes, and the fruit of patience. They obſerved the heavens with great aſſiduity, remarked all the phœnomena which appeared, and tranſmitted them to poſterity. They, like us, divided the ſun's annual courſe into three hundred, ſixty-five parts, and one quarter: they had a confuſed idea of the proceſſion of the equinoxes, and the ſolſtices: and, what perhaps is ſtill more remarkable, they divided the months into weeks of ſeven days. They ſtill ſhew the inſtruments uſed by one of their famous aſtronomers, a thouſand years before the Chriſtian æra, in one of their towns, which is but of the third order. Nanquin, the antient capital, preſerves a braſs globe, which three men can hardly claſp in their embrace, ſuſtained upon a cube of copper that opens: into this, a man is introduced to turn the globe, on which they have marked the meridians and parallels. In Pekin, there is an obſervatory furniſhed with aſtrolabes and armillary ſpheres; inſtruments, which, though inferior to ours in point of accuracy, ſerve as illuſtrious proofs of that ſuperiority which the Chineſe maintained over the other nations of Aſia. True it is, though they knew the compaſs, they did not apply it to its proper uſe of directing the courſe of veſſels at ſea. Their navigation was performed along ſhore. Poſſeſſed of a country that ſupplies all

all their wants, they have no occaſion to roam, like the Europeans, to the ends of the earth. They conſidered the compaſs, as well as gun-powder, in the light of ſimple curioſities; nor were they to be pitied for their ſimplicity.

It is ſurpriſing that this people, ſo happy at invention, have never penetrated beyond the elements of geometry; that in muſic they are even ignorant of ſemitones; and that their aſtronomy, with all their ſciences, ſhould be at once ſo antient and imperfect. Nature ſeems to have beſtowed on this ſpecies of men, ſo different from the Europeans, organs ſufficient to diſcover all at once, what was neceſſary to their happineſs, but incapable to proceed farther: we, on the other hand, were tardy in our diſcoveries; but then we have ſpeedily brought every thing to perfection. The credulity with which thoſe people have always joined the abſurdities of judicial aſtrology to the true theory of the heavens, is not ſo ſurpriſing. That ſuperſtition was once common to all mankind: we ourſelves have not been long cured of it; ſo incident is error to the human mind.

If we enquire wherefore ſo many arts and ſciences, ſo long cultivated without interruption, in China, have, nevertheleſs, made ſo little progreſs; perhaps we ſhall diſcover two cauſes that have retarded their improvement. One is the prodigious reſpect payed by theſe people to every thing tranſmitted from their progenitors. This inveſts whatever is antique with an air of perfection. The other is the nature of their language, which is the firſt principle of all knowledge. The art of communicating ideas by writing, which ought to be plain and ſimple, is with them a taſk of the utmoſt difficulty. Every word is repreſented under a different character; and he is deemed the moſt learned, who knows the greateſt number of characters. Some ſtudious perſons among the Chineſe have grown old before they could learn to write with facility. What they beſt know, cultivate the moſt, and have brought to the greateſt perfection, is morality, and the ſtudy of law. Filial reſpect is the foundation of the Chineſe government. Paternal authority is never infringed. A ſon cannot carry on a

proceſs

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AUG 1912 CAMBRIDGE

proceſs againſt his father, without the conſent of all the relations and friends, and even of the magiſtrates. The learned mandarins are conſidered as the parents of the cities and provinces, and the king as the common father of the empire. This idea, rooted in their hearts, has formed, as it were, one family of this whole immenſe community.

All the vices exiſt here as in other countries, but ſurely they are more reſtricted by the curb of laws conſiſtent and uniform. The learned author of admiral Anſon's voyage expreſſes great contempt for China, becauſe the vulgar at Canton exerted all their artifice to cheat the Engliſh. But are we to judge the government of a mighty nation by the morals of the populace in its frontier places *? Pray, what would the Chineſe have ſaid of us, had they ſuffered ſhipwreck on our coaſts, when the law of nations in Europe confiſcated the effects, and cuſtom authoriſes the murder of the owners?

The continual ceremonies, which, among the Chineſe, lay a reſtraint on ſociety, and are never omitted, except among particular friends within their reſpective houſes, have eſtabliſhed through the whole empire a reſerve and decorum, which inveſt their behaviour with an air of gravity and ſweetneſs. Theſe qualities extend even to the loweſt of the people. The miſſionaries relate, that frequently in the public ſtreets, amidſt that embarraſſment and confuſion, which in our country excite ſuch barbarous clamour, and ſuch brutal quarrels, they have ſeen the Chineſe peaſants throw themſelves on their knees, to aſk pardon of each other for the ſtop of carriages, which every one laid to his own charge, and mutually aſſiſt in diſengaging the whole, without noiſe or tumult.

In

* It is not only at Canton that the Chineſe practiſe deceit; the natives of that country, ſettled in Batavia and other places in the Eaſt Indies, are famous for the art of cheating. This vice may be partly owing to natural cauſes, and partly to the lenity of their laws, which puniſh fraud by fine only. Beſides, it appears from Anſon's voyages, that fraud was not confined to the populace; the very mandarins were detected in the moſt dirty practices of fraud.

In other countries, the laws puniſh the commiſſion of crimes; in China they do more; they recompenſe the practice of virtue. The report of a generous and rare action being diffuſed through a province, the mandarin is obliged to give notice of it to the emperor, who beſtows ſome mark of honour upon him who has ſo well deſerved it. This kind of morality, this ſubmiſſion to the laws, joined to the adoration of a ſupreme being, form that religion which is profeſſed by the emperor and learned men of China. The emperor has been high-prieſt from time immemorial. He ſacrifices to Tien, the ſovereign of heaven and of earth. He ought to be the chief philoſopher, and firſt preacher of the empire. His edicts are generally inſtructions and leſſons of morality *.

CHAP. II.

Of the RELIGION of CHINA.

Demonſtrating, that the government is not atheiſtical; that Chriſtianity was not preached among the Chineſe in the ſeventh century; and giving an account of ſome ſects eſtabliſhed in that country.

CONFUTSEE, by us called † Confucius, who flouriſhed two thouſand three hundred years ago, a little before the time of Pythagoras, eſtabliſhed that religion which is founded upon virtue. He taught and practiſed

* We ſhould be glad to know how our author would reconcile to this excellent ſyſtem of government, and this humane diſpoſition of the Chineſe, the barbarous and inhuman practice of expoſing infants, which prevails through the whole empire of China.

† Confucius was born in the kingdom of Lu, which is now the province of Xantung; and is ſaid to have lived about five hundred years before the birth of Chriſt. He was employed as miniſter by his ſovereign; but, when that monarch would no longer follow his ſage counſel, he reſigned his employment, and retired into the kingdom of Sum, where he publicly taught the ſcience of moral philoſophy, with vaſt reputation.

practiſed it, both in his elevation and humiliation; ſometimes prime-miniſter to a king that was tributary to the emperor: ſometimes an exile, fugitive, and indigent. During his life he had five thouſand diſciples; and after his death his doctrine was embraced by the emperors, the coloa, that is, the mandarins, the men of letters, and all but the lower claſs of people. His family ſtill ſubſiſts; and in a country where there is no other nobility than that derived from actual ſervice, it is diſtinguiſhed from other families, in honour of its founder. To his own memory they pay all honour: not thoſe divine honours to which no man can have any title, but ſuch as are due to a man who communicated the moſt rational ideas of the divinity, which human nature could conceive without the help of revelation. For this reaſon, father Le Comte, and other miſſionaries, affirm, that the Chineſe had knowledge of the true God, when other nations were ſunk in idolatry; and that they ſacrificed to him in the moſt antient temple of the univerſe. The charge of atheiſm, which in theſe weſtern regions is ſo liberally thrown at all who differ from us in point of opinion, has been likewiſe urged againſt the Chineſe. Yet none but ſuch inconſiderate people as we are, in all our diſputes, would preſume to treat a government as atheiſtical, which, in almoſt every edict, mentions, "A ſupreme being, the father "of all nations, who rewards and puniſhes according "to the rules of eternal juſtice; and who has eſtabliſhed "between himſelf and his creatures, a correſpondence "of prayers and benefits, faults and chaſtiſements*." Their religion, indeed, does not admit of rewards and puniſhments to all eternity; and this very circumſtance denotes its antiquity. Moſes himſelf, in the Pentateuch, has not mentioned a future ſtate. The Sadducees among the Jews never believed in futurity; and this doctrine did not prevail, till happily eſtabliſhed after the incarnation by the Lord of life and death†. It is ſuppoſed,

* This ſentence is contained in an edict of the emperor Yontchin.

† This has been the ſubject of much controverſy: but, in our opinion, the learned Leland has plainly proved from Scripture, that the Hebrews believed in a future ſtate.

ſuppoſed, that the men of letters among the Chineſe had no diſtinct idea of an immaterial God; but it was unjuſt to infer from thence, that they were atheiſts. The antient Ægyptians, ſo famous for their religion, did not worſhip Iſis and Oſiris as pure ſpirits. All the deities of antiquity were adored under a human form; and what ſhews the flagrant injuſtice of mankind, even among the Greeks, thoſe were ſtigmatiſed with the appellation of atheiſts, who did not admit of corporeal deities, but in the divinity adored a nature unknown, inviſible, and incomprehenſible.

The famous archbiſhop Navarette ſays, that according to all the interpreters of the ſacred books in China, "The ſoul is deemed an aerial igneous particle, which, "when ſeparated from the body, is re-united to the "ſubſtance of the heavens." This is the very opinion of the Stoics, which Virgil has ſo admirably unfolded in the ſixth book of the Æneid. Now, certain it is, neither the writings of Epictetus, nor the Æneid, are infected with atheiſm. We have calumniated the Chineſe, merely becauſe they differ from us in their ſyſtem of metaphyſics. We ought rather to admire in them two articles of merit, which at once condemn the ſuperſtition of the pagans, and the morals of the chriſtians. The religion of their learned men was never diſhonoured by fables, nor ſtained with quarrels or civil wars. In the very act of charging the government of that vaſt empire with atheiſm, we have been ſo inconſiſtent as to accuſe it of idolatry; an imputation that refutes itſelf. The great miſunderſtanding that prevails concerning the rites of the Chineſe, aroſe from our judging their cuſtoms by our own: for we carry our prejudices, and ſpirit of contention along with us, even to the extremities of the earth. Genuflexion, which among them is a common compliment, we conſider as an act of adoration; we have likewiſe miſtaken a table for an altar: thus we may judge of every other circumſtance. We ſhall ſee in its proper place, the manner in which our miſſionaries were driven from China, by our own diviſions and diſputes.

Some

Some time before the æra of Confucius, Laokiun had introduced a ſect that believed in evil ſpirits, inchantments, and other deluſions. Another ſect, reſembling that of Epicurus, was received and oppoſed in China, five hundred years before Jeſus Chriſt: but, in the firſt century of our æra, that country was deluged by the ſuperſtition of the bonzes. They imported from India the idol Fo, or Foe, which was adored under different names, by the Japoneſe and the Tartars, as a god that deſcended upon earth. The worſhip of this deity was extremely ridiculous; and therefore the better adapted for the vulgar. This religion aroſe in India, about one thouſand years before Chriſt, and infected all the eaſtern parts of Aſia. This was the god which the bonzes preached in China, the talapoins in Siam, and the lamas in Tartary. It is in his name they promiſe eternal life, and that thouſands of bonzes devote their lives to exerciſes of penance, which are horrible to nature. Some of theſe enthuſiaſts lead their lives ſtark naked and in chains; while others wear huge iron collars that bend their bodies double, and keep their foreheads grovelling in the duſt. Their fanaticiſm is infinitely ſubdivided. They are ſuppoſed to caſt out devils, and to work miracles; and they ſell abſolution to the people. Some mandarins have been reconciled to this ſect; and by an infatuation, which proves that the ſame ſuperſtition prevails in every country, they have been known to undergo the tonſure as bonzes, from motives of devotion. It is this very ſect, which in Tartary, has at its head the Dalailama, a living idol whom they adore; and this perhaps is the greateſt triumph of human ſuperſtition.

The Dalailama, as the ſucceſſor and vicar of the god Foe, is ſuppoſed to be immortal. The prieſts keep in reſerve a young lama, deſigned in private to ſucceed the ſovereign pontiff, and accordingly he aſſumes that place, when this, who is deemed immortal, happens to die. The Tartarean princes never ſpeak to him but on the bended knee. He is ſupreme judge of all points of controverſy among the lamas. In a word, he has been

been for ſome time eſtabliſhed on the throne of Thibet *, on the weſt of China. The emperor receives his ambaſſadors, and returns the compliment with very conſiderable preſents.

Theſe ſects are tolerated in China, for the uſe of the vulgar, as coarſe aliment raiſed for their ſubſiſtence; while the magiſtrates and perſons of education, who are in every thing diſtinguiſhed from the vulgar, feed on a purer ſubſtance. Confucius, however, was grieved at this multitude of errors, and at the number of idolaters who prevailed in his time; the ſect of Laokiun having introduced many ſuperſtitions among the common people; inſomuch that he expreſſes himſelf thus in one of his books: "How comes it that we find the ig-"norant populace guilty of ſo many more crimes than "the learned? becauſe the people are governed by "their bonzes."

Indeed many of the learned themſelves have fallen into the error of materialiſm: but this has had no effect upon their morality. They think virtue is ſo neceſſary to mankind, and ſo amiable in herſelf, that there is no need for the knowledge of a God, to make her loved and followed. Beſides, we muſt not imagine that all the Chineſe materialiſts are atheiſts. the firſt fathers of our own church believed that God and his angels were corporeal.

It is pretended that, about the eighth century, during the reign of Charlemagne, the chriſtian religion was known in China. We are aſſured that the miſſionaries found in the province of Kingſching, an inſcription in the Syriac and Chineſe characters. This monument, which is to be ſeen at length in Kircher, atteſts, that a holy man called Olopüen, conducted by the blue clouds, and obſerving the blowing of the winds, arrived from Tachin at China in the year 1092 of the æra of the Seleucides, anſwering to the year of Chriſt 636; that as ſoon as he reached the ſuburbs of the imperial city,

* Thibet is generally ſuppoſed to be one of the kingdoms of Great Tartary; though ſome alledge it is the ſame country as Tangueſtan, ſurrounded with mountains which are always covered with ſnow.

city, the emperor ſent a colao to receive him, and cauſed the chriſtian church to be built for his devotion. This inſcription evidently appears to be one of thoſe pious frauds which always meet with too eaſy credit: the ſage Navarette is of the ſame opinion. The country of Tacin, the æra of the Seleucides, the word Olopüen, which, though ſaid to be Chineſe, reſembles a Spaniſh ſurname, the blue clouds that ſerved as conductors, the chriſtian church ſuddenly built at Pekin for a prieſt of Paleſtine, that could not ſet foot in China without incurring the penalties of death: all theſe circumſtances compared, demonſtrate the abſurdity of the ſuppoſition. Thoſe who are at ſuch pains to ſupport it, do not reflect, that the prieſts whoſe names appear on this pretended monument, were Neſtorians; and therefore they are only conteſting in favour of heretics.

This inſcription is of a piece with another found in Malabar, importing, that St. Thomas arrived in that country in quality of a carpenter, with a rule and ſtake; and that he carried on his ſhoulders a huge beam, as a proof of his miſſion. There is plenty of hiſtorical truths without intermingling ſuch abſurd falſities. It is very certain, that in the time of Charlemagne, the chriſtian religion, as well as the nations that profeſſed it, were utterly unknown in China. Jews there certainly were in this empire: ſeveral families of that nation, equally vagrant and ſuperſtitious, had been ſettled in China two centuries before the chriſtian æra. There they exerciſed the profeſſion of brokers, which the Jews have followed in all parts of the world *.

I purpoſely omit taking a view of Siam, Japan, and all the other countries towards the eaſt and ſouth, until I ſhall come to ſpeak of that period at which the induſtry of the Europeans opened an eaſy way to the extremities of our hemiſphere.

CHAP.

* If the Jews were permitted to ſettle in China, why ſhould a a prieſt of Paleſtine incur the pains of death for ſetting foot in that empire?

CHAP. III.

Of the INDIES.

IN following the ſun's apparent courſe, I firſt arrive at India, or Indoſtan, a country not quite ſo extenſive as China, and better known by the precious commodities which the induſtry of merchants has at all times imported from it, than by any accurate accounts. An almoſt continued chain of mountains ſeems to have fixed its limits on the ſide of China, Tartary, and Perſia; and the reſt is ſurrounded by the ſea. Nevertheleſs, India, on this ſide the Ganges, was long ſubjected to the Perſians; therefore Alexander, the avenger of Greece, and conqueror of Darius, extended his conqueſts as far as the Indian ſtates that were tributary to his enemy. Since the time of that monarch, the Indians have enjoyed their liberty, plunged into an exceſs of effeminacy, occaſioned by the heat of their climate and the richneſs of their ſoil.

The Greeks, before Alexander, travelled into India in queſt of ſcience. There the celebrated Pilpay, about two thouſand three hundred years ago, wrote thoſe moral fables which have been tranſlated into almoſt every language of the known world. The orientals, and particularly the Indians, treated all ſubjects under the veil of fable and allegory: for that reaſon Pythagoras, who ſtudied among them, expreſſes himſelf always in parables. The ſpirit of Pilpay reigned a long time in India. Pachimere, in the thirteenth century, tranſlated ſeveral works compoſed by their ſages: of theſe the following is a very remarkable paſſage: "I have ſeen all the ſects "recriminate upon each other the charge of impoſture: "I have ſeen the magi diſpute with rage and fury, upon "the firſt principle and the ultimate end: I have queſ-"tioned them all, and found in thoſe chiefs of different "faction, nothing but inflexible obſtinacy, ſovereign "contempt, and implacable hatred for one another: "I am therefore reſolved to believe none of their doc-"trines. Theſe doctors, in their reſearches after truth,

" may be compared to a woman who wants to intro-
" duce her gallant by a private paſſage, but cannot find
" the key of the door. Mankind in their vain enqui-
" ries may be likened to him who climbs a tree where
" he finds a ſmall morſel of honey; but ſcarce has he
" eaten it, when he himſelf is devoured by the dragons
" that ſurround the tree which he had aſcended." Such was the manner of writing practiſed among the Indians. Their genius appeared ſtill plainer in the games they invented. Of this ſort, is the game which we by corruption call cheſs. It is allegorical, like their fables; and contrived as the image or repreſentation of war. The word ſheck, which is prince, and pion *, that ſignifies ſoldier, are ſtill preſerved in that part of the eaſt. The arithmetical figures we uſe, which the Arabians imported into Europe about the time of Charlemagne, are originally derived from India. The antique medals, ſo much in requeſt among the Chineſe virtuoſi, may be urged as a proof that the arts were cultivated by the Indians, before they were known in China.

The ſun's courſe was divided into twelve parts from time immemorial. The year of the brachmans, and of the moſt antient gymnoſophiſts, always begun when the ſun entered the conſtellation which they call Moſcham, and is known among us by the appellation of Aries. Their weeks always conſiſted of ſeven days; a diviſion of which the Greeks were ignorant: and their names were diſtinguiſhed by the names of the ſeven planets. Sunday they denominate Mitradinam: but it is not yet known whether the word Mitra, which among the Perſians likewiſe ſignifies the ſun, is originally a term in the language of the magi, or in that of the ſages of India. It is very difficult to diſcover which of theſe two nations taught the other; but if the queſtion was to decide between India and Egypt, I ſhould conclude that the ſciences were much more antient in the former of the countries. My conjecture is formed on theſe circumſtances: the land of India is much more eaſily ſettled than that which borders upon the Nile, whoſe overflowing muſt have for a long time thwarted the firſt inhabi-

tants,

* This is the piece which we call Pawn.

tants, before they could maſter that river by digging canals; beſides the ſoil of India is of a more varied fertility, which muſt have greatly excited the curioſity and induſtry of mankind*. Some have imagined that the human race was originally of Indoſtan, alledging, that the moſt helpleſs animal would naturally be produced in the gentleſt climate; but the origin of almoſt every thing is concealed from our knowledge. Who, for example, will venture to affirm, that our climates produced neither inſects, herbs, nor trees, when all theſe were found in the eaſt?

India, in the time of Charlemagne, was known by name only; and the Indians did not know that any ſuch prince exiſted. The Arabians were ſolely poſſeſſed of maritime commerce, and, at the ſame time, ſupplied Conſtantinople, and the Franks, with the commodities of India. The Venetians, indeed, went to fetch them from Alexandria. The conſumption of them was not yet conſiderable in France, among private perſons; and they were long unknown in Germany, and all the northern countries. The Romans themſelves carried on this traffick, as ſoon as they were maſters of Egypt; thus the weſtern nations have always carried their gold and ſilver into India, increaſing the wealth of that country, which was already ſo rich in its own nature. The Indians being at all times a trading and induſtrious people, were neceſſarily ſubjected to a regular police; and that people whom Pythagoras viſited for improvement, muſt have enjoyed the protection of wholeſome laws, without

* This we take to be a very unſatisfactory reaſon, inaſmuch as it hath been always obſerved, that neceſſity is the mother of induſtry and invention. We ſhould therefore ſuppoſe that geometry muſt have been firſt underſtood in Egypt, becauſe the overflowing of the Nile deſtroyed their land marks, ſo that the natives were obliged to aſcertain their property by the principles of ſurveying. In Chaldæa the ſkies were ſo ſerene as to encourage the ſcience of aſtronomy; though we ſhould rather believe it was beſt known among the Arabians, whoſe country is, in a great meaſure, barren and deſolate, whoſe climate is ſo ſcorching, that they can hardly air abroad in the day, and whoſe chief delight conſiſts in lying on their houſe-tops in the night, and contemplating the heavenly bodies that roll over their heads with ſuch amazing ſplendor, as cannot fail to excite the attention of the moſt incurious.

which the arts are never cultivated; but mankind, even in the midſt of ſenſible laws, have always indulged ridiculous cuſtoms. That which conſtitutes the point of honour and religion among the women, inducing them to burn themſelves on the bodies of their huſbands, ſubſiſted in India from time immemorial, and is not yet aboliſhed. Their philoſophers throw themſelves alive into funeral piles, through exceſs of fanaticiſm and vain glory. Calan, or Calanus, who burned himſelf in preſence of Alexander, was not the firſt who ſet this example. One would imagine, that a nation where the philoſophers, and even the women, thus devoted themſelves to death, muſt be a warlike and invincible people: nevertheleſs, every prince that attacked India has eaſily ſubdued it, ſince the time of the antient Sezac, known by the name of Bacchus.

It would be very difficult to reconcile the ſublime ideas which the brachmans preſerve of the Supreme Being, with their ſuperſtition and fabulous mythology, if hiſtory did not preſent the ſame ſort of contradictions among the Greeks and Romans. Some chriſtians have been ſettled two hundred years on the coaſt of Malabar, in the midſt of theſe idolatrous nations. A Syrian merchant, whoſe name was Mark Thomas, ſettled on that coaſt with his family and factors, in the ſixth century, and there left his religion, which was Neſtorianiſm. Theſe ſectaries multiplying a-pace, aſſumed the name of "The chriſtians of St. Thomas," and lived peaceably among the idolaters: he that lives quiet is ſeldom perſecuted for his religion. Thoſe chriſtians were entirely ignorant of the Latin church.

CHAP. IV.

Of PERSIA, ARABIA, and MAHOMET.

TUrning our attention towards Perſia, we there find, immediately before the period I have choſen as an æra, the moſt important and ſudden revolution that we ever heard of upon earth. A new dominion, religion,

religion, and ſyſtem of morals had entirely changed the face of theſe countries; and this change extended a great way into Africa, Aſia, and Europe. That I may form to myſelf a juſt idea of Mahometaniſm, which hath given a new aſpect to ſo many empires, I will previouſly recapitulate thoſe parts of the world that firſt ſubmitted to its doctrines. Before the time of Alexander, Perſia extended her ſway from Ægypt to Bactriana, beyond the country now known by the name of Samarkande, and from Thrace to the river Indus. Though divided and contracted under the Seleucides, it encreaſed again under Arſaces the Parthian, about 250 years before Chriſt. The Arſacides poſſeſſed neither Syria nor the countries bordering on the Euxine ſea: but they diſputed the empire of the eaſt with the Romans, to whom they always oppoſed inſurmountable barriers. In the time of Alexander Severus, about the year 226 of the chriſtian æra, a private ſoldier of Perſia, aſſuming the name of Artaxares, conquered this kingdom from the Parthians, and eſtabliſhed the Perſian empire, in extent nearly the ſame as it is in theſe our days. You do not deſire to examine in this place who were the firſt Babylonians whom the Perſians conquered, nor in what manner thoſe people boaſted four hundred years of aſtronomical obſervations, though no more of theſe than a ſucceſſion of nineteen hundred years could be found in the time of Alexander. You have no intention to wander from your ſubject, with a view to recollect the idea of the greatneſs of Babylon, and thoſe monuments more ſpecious than ſolid, whoſe very ruins are deſtroyed. No remains of the Aſiatic arts challenge, in any degree, our attention, except the ruins of Perſepolis deſcribed in ſeveral books, and exhibited in a variety of copper-plates. I know what admiration has been excited by thoſe fragments that eſcaped the torches with which Alexander and the courtezan Thais reduced Perſepolis to aſhes. But ſhall we give the epithet of a maſter-piece of art to this palace, built at the foot of a chain of deſert rocks? Certainly the columns that are ſtill ſtanding, can neither boaſt of fine proportions nor

elegant deſign. The capitals overloaded with rude ornaments, are almoſt as high as the ſhafts of the pillars. All the figures are as hard and heavy as thoſe with which our Gothic churches are ſtill unhappily adorned. They are monuments of greatneſs, but not of taſte; and the whole ſerves to confirm us in the opinion, that a reader, in confining himſelf to the hiſtory of the arts, would find but four ages in the annals of the world; namely, thoſe of Alexander, Auguſtus, the Medicis, and Lewis XIV.

The Perſians, however, were always an ingenious people. Locman, the ſame as Æſop *, was born at Caſbin. This tradition is much more probable than that which derives him from Æthiopia, a country that never produced philoſophers. The maxims of the antient Zerduſt, called Zoroaſter by the Greeks, who have changed all the oriental names, ſtill ſubſiſted. They are ſaid to be nine thouſand years old; for the Perſians, as well as the Ægyptians, Indians, and Chineſe, puſh back the origin of the world as much as other nations bring it forward. A ſecond Zoroaſter, in the reign of Darius, the ſon of Hyſtaſpes, did no more than bring this antient religion to perfection. It is in theſe maxims that we find the firſt notions of the immortality of the ſoul, and of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. There we ſee an expreſs deſcription of hell. Zoroaſter, in the writings preſerved by Sadder, feigns that God had indulged him with a ſight of hell, and the pains reſerved for the wicked: there, among ſeveral kings, he perceived one without a foot, and aſked God the reaſon of this mutilation. God replied, "That wicked king did but one good action in the whole courſe of his life. Going one day to the chace, he ſaw a dromedary tethered at ſuch a diſtance from his trough, that he could not reach it ſo as to eat his provender; he kicked the trough nearer the animal; and that foot I have placed in

* Æſop, if we may believe Maximus Planudes, Plutarch, Meziriac, Suidas, and Le Clerc, was a native of Phrygia, born in the town of Amorium, cotemporary with Solon, and ſubject to Cræſus, the laſt king of Lydia.

in heaven; the reſt of him remains here in heli," This paſſage, which is very little known, ſhews the kind of philoſophy cultivated in thoſe remote times: a ſpecies of philoſophy always allegorical, and ſometimes very profound. The Babylonians were the firſt who admitted of intermediate beings between God and man. The Jews did not beſtow names upon the angels, till the time of their captivity in Babylon. The name of Satan, which firſt appeared in the book of Job, is a Perſian word; and Job is ſaid to have been of the ſame country. The word Raphael is uſed by Tobit, who was captive in Nineveh, and wrote in the Chaldaic language.

The two principles of Zoroaſter, Oroſmades, or Oromazes, the antient of days, and Arimanes, the genius of darkneſs, gave birth to the manichean doctrine. It is the Oſiris and Typhon of the Ægyptians; the Pandora of the Greeks, the vain effort of all the ſages to explain the origin of good and evil. This theology of the magi was reſpected in the Eaſt, under all governments; and in the midſt of every different revolution, the antient religion was ſtill maintained in Perſia, where neither the gods of the Grecians, nor any other deities ever prevailed.

Nouſturvan, or Coſroes the Great, towards the end of the ſixth century, had extended his empire into part of Arabia Petræa, and Arabia Felix. From thence he expelled the Abyſſinian Chriſtians, by whom it had been invaded. He proſcribed Chriſtianity as much as he could within his own dominions, driven to this ſeverity by the treachery of his ſon-in-law, who embraced the Chriſtian religion, and raiſed a rebellion againſt his ſovereign. In the laſt year of this famous king's reign, Mahomet was born at Mecca, in Arabia Petræa, on the 5th of May, in the year 570. His country was at this time involved in war, for the defence of her liberty, againſt the Perſians and the princes of Conſtantinople, who ſtill retained the name of Roman emperors. The children of Nouſturvan the Great, unworthy of ſuch a father, laid waſte their own country with civil war and parricide. The ſucceſſors of the wiſe Juſtinian intailed

contempt upon the name of the empire. Mauritius was dethroned by the arms of Phocas, reinforced with the intrigues of the patriarch of Cyriaca and other biſhops, whom he afterwards puniſhed for having ſerved him ſo effectually. The blood of Mauritius, and his five children had flowed under the hand of the executioner; and Pope Gregory the Great, a bitter enemy to the patriarchs of Conſtantinople, endeavoured to gain over the tyrant Phocas to his intereſts, by loading him with the moſt extravagant praiſe, and condemning the memory of Mauritius, whom, in his life, he had as extravagantly extolled.

The empire of Rome, in the Weſt, was annihilated. A deluge of barbarians, Goths, Heruli, Huns, and Vandals, overflowed Europe, when Mahomet laid the foundation of the Muſſulman religion and power, in the deſerts of Arabia.

Every body knows that Mahomet was the younger ſon of an indigent family; that he was a long time in the ſervice of a woman called Cadiſche, who exerciſed the profeſſion of a merchant in Mecca; that he married his miſtreſs, and lived obſcure to the age of forty. It was not till then he diſplayed thoſe talents, which ſpoke him ſo much ſuperior to all his fellow-citizens. He poſſeſſed a warm and nervous eloquence, deſtitute of art and method, ſuch as was neceſſary to harangue the Arabs; an air of authority and inſinuation, animated by piercing eyes, and ſupported by a happy phyſiognomy; the intrepidity and liberality of an Alexander, and that ſobriety which Alexander wanted to be completely great in every part of his character. Love, the neceſſary conſequence of a warm conſtitution, to which he owed ſo many wives and concubines, neither weakened his courage, his application, nor his health. In this manner he is deſcribed by the Arabian writers who were his cotemporaries; and his conduct verifies the picture.

After having made himſelf entirely acquainted with the character of his countrymen; their ignorance, credulity, and aptitude to enthuſiaſm, he plainly perceived that he ſhould be able to erect himſelf into a prophet.

He

He feigned revelations; he uttered predictions; he gained credit with his own family, which was perhaps the moſt difficult part of his undertaking. In three years he had acquired two and forty diſciples, who believed in him implicitly: Omar, who had been his perſecutor, became his apoſtle; and at the end of five years the number of theſe amounted to one hundred and fourteen.

He taught the Arabians, who worſhipped the ſtars, that their adoration was due to God alone, by whom they were created: that the Jewiſh and Chriſtian books were corrupted and falſified; and therefore ought to be held in abhorrence: that all mankind were obliged, on pain of eternal puniſhment, to pray five times a-day, and give charity; above all things, to acknowledge but one God; to believe in Mahomet as his laſt prophet; and, in a word, to hazard their lives for their religion. He forbad the uſe of wine, becauſe the abuſe of it was attended with dangerous conſequences. He retained the rite of circumciſion, which had been obſerved by the Arabians as well as by the antient Ægyptians, inſtituted, in all probability, to prevent the firſt powers of manhood from being abuſed; a practice by which youth is often enervated *. He allowed polygamy, a cuſtom immemorial in all eaſtern countries. He made no alteration in the ſyſtem of morality, which has always been fundamentally the ſame in every nation, and which no legiſlator has preſumed to corrupt. In other reſpects, his religion was more ſlaviſh than any other, in its lawful ceremonies, in the number and form of prayers and ablutions. Nothing hampers human nature more than practices which ſhe does not require, eſpecially if

* It will be no eaſy taſk to ſhew in what manner circumciſion prevents the abuſe of puberty. Perhaps it would be leſs difficult to prove that this operation is productive of a ſpurious paſſion, not fit to be named, which has prevailed in all ages among thoſe who have undergone circumciſion. The moſt feaſible reaſon for its having been inſtituted in warm climates is, that it prevented thoſe excoriations which in hot countries are occaſioned by a glandular diſcharge pent up between the prepuce and the part which it naturally covers.

they muſt be daily renewed. As a recompence for the righteous, he promiſed immortality in a future ſtate, where the ſoul ſhould be intoxicated with ſpiritual pleaſures; and the body, raiſed again to life with all its faculties, enjoy every ſenſual delight. Thus religion is diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of Iſlamiſm, which ſignifies revelation to the will of God. The book that contains it is entitled the Koran, that is, "The book, the writing, or the reading," by way of excellence.

All the interpreters of this work agree, that the morality it inculcates is contained in theſe words: "Court thoſe who drive you out; give to thoſe who ſtrip you; forgive thoſe who injure you; do good to all; and never diſpute with the ignorant." He ſhould have rather warned his people to avoid diſputes with the learned; but, in that part of the world, they never dreamed that any other country was enlightened with ſcience.

Among the incoherent rhapſodies that abound in this book, according to the oriental taſte, we find, nevertheleſs, ſome inſtances, of the true ſublime. Mahomet, for example, ſpeaking of the ceſſation of the deluge, makes uſe of theſe expreſſions: "God ſaid, earth ſwallow up thy waters: heaven draw up thoſe ſtreams thou haſt poured forth. The heaven and the earth obeyed." His definition of God is really ſublime. Being aſked who was that Alla whom he announced; "He it is, (he replied) who holds his being of himſelf, and of whom all other beings hold their exiſtence: who neither engenders nor is engendered; and to whom nothing can be likened through the whole extent of being."

True it is, the book is crowded with contradictions, abſurdities, and anachroniſms. Thro' the whole of it we perceive a total ignorance of the moſt ſimple and beſt known principles of natural philoſophy. This is the touch-ſtone of the books which the profeſſors of falſe religion pretend to be written by divine inſpiration; for God is neither ignorant nor abſurd: yet they are adored by the vulgar, who cannot diſcern theſe errors, which the imans employ a deluge of words to palliate.

Some

Some people concluded, from an equivocal paſſage of the alcoran, that Mahomet could neither read nor write; a circumſtance, which, if true, would have rendered his ſucceſs ſtill more prodigious. But it is not at all likely, that a man, who had been ſo long in trade, ſhould be ignorant of that which was ſo neceſſary in traffick: it is ſtill more improbable that a man, ſo well verſed in the hiſtories and mythology of his country, ſhould be ignorant of that which even the children practiſed. Beſides, the Arabian authors relate, that Mahomet on his death-bed called for the implements of writing.

He was perſecuted at Mecca, and his flight from that city, which is denominated Hejira, became the æra of his glory, as well as the foundation of his empire. From a fugitive he ſtarted up a conqueror. While a refugee at Medina, he made converts of the people, and uſed them for the accompliſhment of his deſigns. He, firſt of all, with one hundred and thirty men, defeated the inhabitants of Mecca, who marched againſt him to the number of a thouſand. This victory, which appeared a miracle, in the eyes of his followers, perſuaded them that God fought for them as they fought for his glory. From the firſt victory they preſaged the conqueſt of the world. Mahomet took Mecca, and ſaw his perſecutors humbled at his feet. In nine years, by his preaching and his arms, he conquered all Arabia, a country as extenſive as Perſia, which neither the Perſians nor the Romans could ſubdue. In the beginning of his ſucceſs, he had written to Coſroes II. ſovereign of Perſia, to the emperor Heraclius, to the prince of the Coptes, governor of Ægypt, to the king of the Abyſſinians, and to a monarch called Mandar, who reigned over a province in the neighbourhood of the Perſian gulph. He had the boldneſs to propoſe that they ſhould embrace his religion; and what is more aſtoniſhing, two of theſe princes actually turned Mahometans; theſe were the kings of Abyſſinia, and this Mandar. Coſroes tore the letter in a tranſport of indignation. Heraclius ſent valuable preſents, by way of anſwer, to Mahomet. The Coptic prince preſented him with a maiden who was deemed a maſter-

maſter-piece of nature, and known by the epithet of the "Beautiful Mary."

Mahomet, at the expiration of nine years, believing himſelf ſtrong enough to extend his conqueſts and religion among the Greeks and Perſians, began with an invaſion of Syria, at that time ſubject to Heraclius, from whom he wreſted divers cities. This emperor, intoxicated with metaphyſical diſputes concerning religion, who had eſpouſed the doctrine of the Monothelites, received, almoſt at the ſame time, two very ſingular propoſals; one from Coſroes, by whom he had been long ſubdued, and the other from Mahomet. The firſt inſiſted upon his embracing the religion of the magi; and Mahomet expreſſed his deſire that he ſhould become a Muſſulman.

The new prophet left it to the option of thoſe he conquered, either to profeſs his religion, or pay a tribute, which was regulated by the alcoran at thirteen drachmas of ſilver annually for every head of a family. Such a moderate tax plainly proves, that the people who ſubmitted were extremely poor: but the tribute has been greatly increaſed ſince that period. Of all the legiſlators who have founded religions, he alone extended his by dint of conqueſt. Other nations have introduced their worſhip among their neighbours with fire and ſword; but no founder of a ſect was at the ſame time a conqueror. This privilege alone is, in the eyes of Muſſulmans, an inconteſtible proof that the Deity took eſpecial care to aſſiſt the efforts of their prophet.

At length Mahomet, having made himſelf maſter of Arabia, and formidable to all his neighbours, was attacked by a mortal diſtemper at Medina, in the ſixty-fourth year of his age; and reſolving that his laſt moments ſhould denote the hero and the ſaint, exclaimed: "Let him whom I have injured or oppreſſed appear, and I am ready to make reparation." A man ſtood up, and demanded payment of a ſum that was due to him from the prophet: Mahomet ordered it to be paid immediately, and in a little time expired, reſpected as a great man, even by thoſe who knew he was an impoſtor;

tor; and revered as a prophet by the reſt of his countrymen.

His cotemporaries of Arabia wrote a very circumſtantial detail of his life. The whole ſavours ſtrong of the barbarous ſimplicity of the times called heroic. His contract of marriage with his firſt wife, is expreſſed in theſe terms: "While Cadiſche continues to love Mahomet, and is in like manner beloved of him." We find a minute deſcription of the banquets which his wives prepared; with the very names of his ſwords and horſes. One may obſerve through the whole character of his people, a ſtrong conformity in manners with the antient Hebrews, I ſpeak only of manners; the ſame ardour to engage in battle in the name of the Lord, the ſame thirſt after plunder, the ſame diviſion of the ſpoil, and every part of their conduct pointing towards this object.

But, without conſidering any other than human circumſtances, and ſtill abſtracting from the judgments of God, and the myſterious ways of providence, we may aſk why Mahomet and his ſucceſſors, who began their conqueſts preciſely in the manner of the Jews, were ſo much ſuperior to them in their atchievements and ſucceſs? Was not the difference owing to the different conduct of the two nations? The Muſſulmans exerting their chief care in ſubjecting the vanquiſhed to their religion, ſometimes by force, and ſometimes by dint of perſuaſion. The Hebrews, on the contrary, never admitted foreigners into a participation of their worſhip. The Arabian Muſſulmans always incorporated other nations with their own: the Hebrews carefully ſecluded themſelves from every other people. In a word, the Arabians ſeem to have poſſeſſed a more courageous enthuſiaſm, with a more bold and generous policy. The Hebrews looked with horror on all other nations, in the apprehenſion of being enſlaved: whereas the people of Arabia endeavoured to attract every thing, and believed themſelves created for dominion. Mahomet's laſt will was not executed. He had bequeathed the empire to his ſon-in-law Hali, and his daughter Fatima: but ambition, which even tranſcends fanaticiſm, engaged the chiefs

chiefs of the army to declare old Abubeker, his father-in-law, caliph, that is, vicar of the prophet, in hope of being ſoon able to ſhare the ſucceſſion among themſelves. Hali, mean while, remained in Arabia, waiting for an opportunity to ſignalize his talents.

Abubeker's firſt ſtep was to collect, in one volume the ſcattered ſheets of the Koran; the chapters of the book were read in preſence of all the chiefs, and its authenticity was invariably eſtabliſhed. In a little time Abubeker marched at the head of his Muſſulmans into Paleſtine, where he defeated the brother of Heraclius. He died ſoon after this victory, with the reputation of the moſt generous man alive: for his own ſhare of the booty, which was divided, he never took more than about twenty pence a-day; thereby demonſtrating how well a contempt of low ſelf-intereſt will agree with that ambition which ſelf-intereſt of an higher order inſpires.

Abubeker is eſteemed among the Mahometans, as a great character, and a faithful Muſſulman: he is reckoned one of the ſaints of the Koran. The Arabians record that his laſt will was couched in theſe terms: "In the name of God moſt merciful, this is the laſt will of Abubeker, made at a time when he was about to paſs from this world to the next; at a time when infidels begin to believe, when the wicked ceaſe to doubt, and the liar tells the truth." This ſeems to be the preamble of a man who was really convinced; yet Abubeker, as the father-in-law of Mahomet, had opportunities of examining the prophet nearly. He muſt either have been deceived himſelf, or acted as accomplice in an illuſtrious impoſture, which he looked upon as a neceſſary fraud. The rank he maintained obliged him to ſupport at his death, what in his life-time he had impoſed on his fellow-creatures.

Omar, choſen his ſucceſſor, was one of the moſt rapid conquerors that ever ravaged the face of the earth. His firſt exploit was the reduction of Damaſcus, famous for the fertility of its ſoil, for its ſteel manufactures, the beſt in the world, and the ſilk ſtuffs that ſtill bear its name. The Greeks, who aſſumed the name of Romans, he drove from Syria and Phœnicia.

After

After a long ſiege, he, by capitulation, got poſſeſſion of Jeruſalem, which had been almoſt always in the hands of foreigners, from the time when David wreſted it from its ancient poſſeſſors.

At the ſame period, Omar's lieutenants advanced into Perſia. The laſt of the Perſian kings, whom we call Hormiſdas IV. gives battle to the Arabians within a few leagues of Madain, the capital of that empire. He loſes the battle with his life; and the Perſians acknowledge the dominion of Omar, even more eaſily than they had formerly ſubmitted to the yoke of Alexander. Then fell that antient religion of the Magi, which had been reſpected by the conqueror of Darius; for he never encroached upon the religion of the nations whom he ſubdued.

The Magi adored one God, were enemies to idolatry, and revered the fire that animates nature, as an emblem of the Deity. They looked upon their own worſhip as the moſt antient and pure of all religions. Their knowledge of mathematics, aſtronomy, and hiſtory, increaſed their contempt for their conquerors, who were at that time extremely ignorant. They could not abandon a religion conſecrated through ſo many ages for the upſtart ſect of their enemies. The greater part of them retired to the confines of Perſia and India: there they live at this day, under the denomination of Gaures or Guebres, marrying only among themſelves, maintaining the ſacred fire, and faithfully attached to all they know of their antient worſhip; but altogether ignorant, deſpiſed, and, except in their poverty, reſembling the Jews, ſo long diſperſed, without mingling in alliance with other nations: but they may be ſtill more properly compared to the Banyans, who are eſtabliſhed and diſperſed in no other countries but Perſia and India. A great number of Guebre families, or Ignicolæ, remained, at Iſpahan, till the reign of Sha-abas, who baniſhed them in the ſame manner as Iſabella expelled the Jews from Spain. Theſe Ignicolæ have for a long time anathematized Alexander and Mahomet in their prayers: in all probability they now extend their curſes to Sha-abas alſo.

While

While one of Omar's lieutenants ſubdues Perſia, another conquers from the Romans the whole country of Ægypt, and great part of Lybia. It was in the courſe of this war that they burned the famous library at Alexandria, a monument of the knowledge, as well as of the errors of mankind, begun by Ptolomy Philadelphus, and augmented by ſuch a number of monarchs. At that time the Saracens rejected all ſcience but what was contained in the Koran; but they had already demonſtrated that their genius was capable of extending to every ſubject. Their undertaking to renew the old canal firſt dug by the kings of Ægypt, and afterwards repaired by Trajan, for joining the Nile and the Red Sea, was an enterprize worthy of the moſt enlightened ages. A governor of Ægypt undertakes, and even accompliſhes this great work in the caliphate of Omar. What a wide difference between the genius of the Arabians, and that of the Turks! Theſe laſt have let a work run to ruin, the preſervation of which was of greater conſequence than the conqueſt of a mighty province.

The ſucceſs of that conquering people ſeems rather to have been owing to the enthuſiaſm by which they were animated, and to the ſpirit of the nation in general, than to the ability of their conductors; for Omar was aſſaſſinated in the year 603, by a Perſian ſlave, and Otman, his ſucceſſor, met with the ſame fate in an inſurrection that happened in 655. Hali, the celebrated ſon-in-law of Mahomet, is not elected to the ſovereign power until the ſtate is involved in troubles. Like his predeceſſors, he is murdered in five years; and in the mean time the Muſſulman arms are always proſperous. This Hali, whom the Perſians revere at this day, and whoſe principles they follow in oppoſition to thoſe of Omar, at length obtains the caliphate, and transfers the ſeat of the Caliphs from Medina, where Mahomet lies buried, to Couffa, on the banks of the Euphrates, a city of which ſcarce any ruins now remain. This was the fate of Babylon, Seleucia, and all the antient cities of Chaldea, which were wholly built of bricks.

It is very evident, that the genius of the Arabians, ſet in motion by Mahomet, did every thing by dint of its own ſtrength for the ſpace of near three centuries; thus reſembling the genius of the antient Romans. Nay, it was in the reign of Valid, the moſt unwarlike of all the caliphs, that their greateſt conqueſts were atchieved. One of his generals, in the year 707, extended his empire as far as Samarkande. Another, at the ſame time, invaded the empire of the Greeks, towards the Black Sea. A third, in the year 711, ſailed from Ægypt into Spain, a country which has been with eaſe ſubdued ſucceſſively by the Carthaginians, the Romans, the Goths, and Vandals, and at length by theſe Arabs, who were known by the appellation of Moors. There they at firſt founded the kingdom of Cordova. The ſultan of Ægypt indeed ſhook off the yoke of the great caliph of Bagdat; and Abderame, governor of Spain, which he had conquered, no longer acknowledged the ſultan of Ægypt: but for all that, it was to the arms of the Muſſulmans that all thoſe ſucceſſes were owing.

This Abderame *, the grandſon of caliph Heſham, ſubdued the kingdoms of Caſtile, Navarre, Portugal, and Arragon: he made a ſettlement in Languedoc, became maſter of Guienne and Poitou; and had not Charles Martel deprived him of his good fortune and his life together, France would have been a Mahometan province.

After the reigns of nineteen caliphs of the houſe of the Ommiades, the dynaſty of the caliphs Abaſides began about the year 752 of the chriſtian æra: Abougiafar Almanzor, the ſecond caliph of this race, fixed the ſeat of that great empire at Bagdat in Chaldæa, on the other ſide of the river Euphrates. The Turks ſay he laid the foundation of this city; the Perſians aſſure us it was of great antiquity, and that he did no more than order it to be repaired. This is the city which is ſometimes

* Abderame I. or Abdalrachman, was ſurnamed Abdel, or the juſt: nevertheleſs, he ravaged all Spain, and compelled all his neighbour kings to pay him tribute; from Aurelius he exacted a yearly ſupply of one hundred young maidens.

times called Babylon, and has been the ſource of ſo many wars between Perſia and Turkey †.

The dominion of the caliphs laſted 655 years. Though deſpotic in religion as well as in government, they were never worſhipped like the great lama: but they enjoyed a more ſubſtantial authority; and even in the times of their decay they met with reſpect from thoſe princes by whom they were perſecuted. All the ſultans, whether Turks, Arabians, or Tartars, received the inveſtiture from the caliphs, with much leſs diſpute than many chriſtian princes have had with the pope on the ſame ſubject. They did not kiſs the caliph's feet; but they proſtrated themſelves upon the threſhold of his palace.

If ever power threatened the whole earth with ſubjection, it was that of the caliphs: for they poſſeſſed the right of the throne, and of the altar; of the ſword, and of the ſpirit; their orders were received as oracles, and their ſoldiers were ſo many deſperate enthuſiaſts. In the year 671, they beſieged Conſtantinople, which was doomed to be one day a Mahometan capital, and the almoſt inevitable diſſentions among ſo many ferocious chiefs did not ſtop the courſe of their conqueſts. In this particular they reſembled the antient Romans, who in the midſt of their civil wars ſubdued the country of Aſia Minor.

The politeneſs of the Mahometans increaſed with their power. Thoſe caliphs, ſtill acknowledged ſovereigns in religion, and as apparent head of the empire, even by thoſe diſtant princes who no longer obeyed their orders, lived quietly in their new Babylon, and the arts ſoon revived under their countenance and protection. Aaron Rachild, cotemporary with Charlemagne, and more reſpected than any of his predeceſſors, whoſe commands were obeyed in Spain, and in the Indies, reanimated the ſciences, taught the agreeable and uſeful arts to flouriſh, invited learned men into his empire,

† Bagdat is ſituated, not on the Euphrates, but on the river Tigris, in the province of Yerach; it is the antient Seleucia, which was built from the ruins of Babylon. The Arabians call it Dar-al-Sani, which ſignifies the Peaceful habitation.

pire, compoſed verſes, and took ſuch meaſures, that, throughout his vaſt dominions, barbarity gave way to politeneſs. In his reign, the Arabians, who had already adopted the Indian cyphers, imported them into Europe. In Germany and France, we had no other knowledge of aſtronomy but what we learned of the ſame people. The ſingle word almanack is ſtill a proof of this aſſertion.

The Almagiſt of Ptolomey was at that time tranſlated from the Greek into the Arabic language, by the aſtronomer Benhonain. The caliph Almamon cauſed a degree of the meridian to be meaſured geometrically, in order to determine the magnitude of the earth; an operation which was not performed in France till nine hundred years after this period, in the reign of Lewis XIV. The ſame aſtronomer Benhonain made conſiderable progreſs in his obſervations: he diſcovered that either Ptolomy had fixed the ſun's utmoſt declination too far northwards, or that the obliquity of the ecliptic was changed; he even perceived that the period of ſix and thirty thouſand years, aſſigned for the revolution of the fixed ſtars from eaſt to weſt, muſt be conſiderably abridged.

Chemiſtry and medicine were carefully cultivated by the Arabians. Chemiſtry, which among us is now brought to perfection, we learned from them, and them only; to them we owe the new remedies termed Minoratives, more gentle and ſalutary than thoſe formerly uſed in the ſchools of Hippocrates and Galen. In a word, even in the ſecond century after Mahomet, the Chriſtians of the Weſt received all their inſtructions from the Muſſulmans.

One infallible proof of the ſuperiority of a nation in the arts that depend upon genius, is their bringing the culture of poetry to perfection. I do not mean thoſe inflated and bombaſt metaphors, conſiſting of inſipid, common-place alluſions to the ſun, moon, ſtars, ſeas, and mountains; but that ſort of ſenſible and energic poetry which flouriſhed in the Auguſtan age, and revived in the reign of Lewis XIV. That poetry, compoſed of image and ſentiment, was well known in the time

time of Aaron Rachild. Among other ſtriking paſſages, I ſhall quote the following, becauſe it is ſhort; it turns upon the celebrated ſtory of the misfortunes that befel Giafar, one of the Barmecides *.

Frail mortal, with preſumpt'ous pride,
By Fortune's treach'rous gifts elate,
Behold the end of Barmecide,
And tremble at thy proſp'rous fate †.

The laſt line is literally tranſlated; and nothing, in my opinion, can be more beautiful than this apophthegm, "Tremble at thy own proſperity." The Arabic language had the advantage of having been long brought to perfection: it was fixed before the time of Mahomet, and has not been altered ſince that period. There is not the leaſt trace remaining of any jargon that was ſpoke at

* This was the moſt illuſtrious private family in all Aſia. Fadhil, Gaifar, Mahomet, and Muſſa, were four brothers of the moſt ſhining merit, who, after having performed the moſt ſignal ſervices to their country, fell under the diſgrace of Aaron al Rachid. This caliph is ſaid to have decreed, that no perſon ſhould mention their names on pain of death. Notwithſtanding this order, an old man, called Monder, ventured to harangue in the public ſtreets, upon the virtues of the Barmecides: for this preſumption he was condemned to death, and begged permiſſion to ſpeak a few words to the caliph before his execution. This requeſt being granted, he made ſuch a pathetic ſpeech in favour of the Barmecides, and painted the caliph's obligations to them in ſuch ſtrong colours, that Aaron was moved to compaſſion, pardoned the old man, and preſented him with a golden diſh from his own table. Monder having proſtrated himſelf before his prince, exclaimed, "Behold another favour which I have received from the Barmecides." A ſaying, which, in the ſequel, became proverbial.

† This is ſomething different from the paſſage of the Perſian poet, cited by D'Herbelot. His quotation is much more figurative and poetical than that inſerted by M. de Voltaire, though I believe they were both taken from the ſame original. The paſſage in D'Herbelot is to this effect; "Child of fortune, who, for a ſhort ſeaſon, art ſuckled with the milk of proſperity, which flows from her empoiſoned breaſts, be not too much elated with the happineſs of thy condition, whilſt thou art ſtill rocking in the cradle, and tottering in the uncertainty of life; remember only the time when thou ſaweſt the greatneſs of the Barmecides."

at that time in Europe *. To which ſide ſoever we turn ourſelves, it muſt be confeſſed that we are but of yeſterday: we have made greater progreſs than other people, in more than one art and ſcience; perhaps we proceed the faſter, becauſe we begin ſo late.

CHAP. V.

Of ITALY and the CHURCH before the Time of CHARLEMAGNE.

NOthing is more worthy of our curioſity, than the manner in which God brought about the eſtabliſhment of his church, by making ſecond cauſes coincide and concur with his eternal decrees. Let us leave, with the utmoſt reverence, the divine part in the hands of thoſe with whom it is depoſited; and confine ourſelves ſolely to that which is hiſtorical. The diſciples of St. John eſtabliſhed themſelves at firſt in Arabia, the neighbouring country to Jeruſalem; but the diſciples of Chriſt diſperſed themſelves over the face of the earth. The Platonic philoſophers of Alexandria, where there was ſuch a number of Jews, aſſociated themſelves with the firſt Chriſtians at Rome, in the reign of Nero; and theſe were confounded with the Jews, becauſe they were in effect their countrymen, ſpoke the ſame language, and abſtained, like them, from thoſe meats that were forbidden by the law of Moſes; nay, many of them were actually circumciſed, and obſerved the Sabbath.

The number of the Jews that ſtill remained at Rome amounted to four thouſand: there had been double that number in the time of Auguſtus; but Tiberius tranſported one half to Sardinia, in order to people that iſland, and diminiſh the number of uſurpers at Rome. Far from being reſtricted in their worſhip, they enjoyed that

* Our author muſt ſurely be miſtaken in this particular; both the Celtic and Teutonic are older than the time of Mahomet, and partly underſtood even at this day.

that toleration which the Romans freely granted to all religions; they were even allowed to have ſynagogues and judges of their own nation; privileges which they enjoy at this day in modern Rome, where they are ſtill more numerous. Their hatred of the Chriſtians was implacable; they accuſed them as authors of the conflagration that deſtroyed one half of Rome in the reign of Nero. It was as unjuſt to accuſe the Chriſtians of that accident, as to impute it to the emperor *. Neither he, nor the Chriſtians, nor the Jews, could have any intereſt in burning the city of Rome: but there was a neceſſity for appeaſing the people that roſe againſt the foreigners, who were equally hated by Jews and Romans. Some unfortunate wretches were ſacrificed as victims to the vengeance of the populace. This tranſient outrage, however, ought not to be reckoned among the perſecutions they underwent for their faith; it had no affinity with their religion, which was not known, and which the Romans confounded with Judaiſm, a religion which their laws protected. True it is, the antiquaries have found in Spain certain inſcriptions, in which Nero is thanked for having aboliſhed a new ſuperſtition in that province; but the authenticity of theſe monument is very much doubted. Allowing them to be authentic, they do not mention Chriſtianity; and even if theſe cruel monuments relate to Chriſtians, to whom are they to be aſcribed, but to the jealouſy of the Jews ſettled in Spain, who abhorred Chriſtianity as an enemy engendered in their own boſoms? We will carefully avoid all attempts to remove that impenetrable obſcurity which veils the cradle of the infant-church; a veil which learning itſelf has only ſerved to double.

What

* Suetonius and Dion Caſſius poſitively aſſert, that Nero was the author of this conflagration. Tacitus owns it was aſcribed to that emperor. Some perſons were ſeen to throw lighted fire brands into the houſes, and publicly declared they were authorized ſo to do. Certain it is, he viewed the flames from the tower of Mæcenas, and chanted a poem compoſed on the deſtruction of Troy. We are not to expect ſolid reaſons for the actions of a prince, whoſe conduct was wholly influenced by the moſt extravagant folly and caprice.

What we are aſſured of is, that it never was the genius of the Roman ſenate to perſecute any perſon for his faith; and that none of the emperors had the leaſt intention to compel the Jews to change their religion, neither after the revolt under Veſpaſian, nor in conſequence of that which broke out in the reign of Adrian. Their worſhip indeed was always inſulted and ridiculed, and ſtatues were erected in the temple before it was deſtroyed; but it never entered into the head of any emperor, proconſul, or Roman ſenate, to hinder the Jews from believing their own law. This circumſtance only ſerves to ſhew what ſcope Chriſtianity had to extend itſelf in ſecret.

None of the Cæſars, before Domitian, ever diſturbed the Chriſtians. Dion Caſſius tells us, that under this emperor ſome perſons were condemned as Atheiſts, and as imitating the Jewiſh cuſtoms: but this diſturbance about which we are ſo much in the dark, was neither general, nor of long duration. We neither preciſely know the reaſons for which ſome Chriſtians were baniſhed, nor thoſe for which they were recalled. What credit can we give to Tertullian, who, upon the faith of Hegeſippus, ſeriouſly relates, that Domitian interrogated the grand-children of the apoſtle St. Jude, of the race of David, whoſe right to the throne of Judea began to make him uneaſy; but that, perceiving they were indigent and miſerable, he deſiſted from further perſecution? Had it been poſſible, that a Roman emperor ſhould dread the pretended deſcendants of David, even after Jeruſalem was deſtroyed, his policy would have been directed to the Jews, and not to the Chriſtians: but how can we ſuppoſe that he, who was maſter of all the known world, ſhould feel diſquietude about the pretenſions which two of the grand-children of St. Jude might have to the kingdom of Paleſtine; and that he ſhould queſtion them on the ſubject? Unhappily, in this manner has hiſtory been written by a great number of authors, whoſe piety was much preferable to their materials and underſtanding.

Nerva, Veſpaſian, Titus, Trajan, Adrian, and the Antonines, never perſecuted the church. Trajan, who had

had forbid private aſſociations, writes to Pliny, "Let no inquiries be made againſt the Chriſtians." Theſe eſſential words, "No inquiry," prove, that it was in their power to conceal and ſupport themſelves with a little diſcretion; though the zeal of prieſts, and the hatred of the Jews, often dragged them to trial, and expoſed them to puniſhment. They were rancorouſly hated by the populace, eſpecially in the provinces, who excited the magiſtrates againſt them, and loudly exclaimed that they ſhould be expoſed to wild beaſts in the Circus. Adrian not only forbade Fondanus, the proconſul of Aſia Minor, to perſecute them, but his decree imports, "If the Chriſtians are ſlandered, let the calumniator be "ſeverely chaſtiſed." From this inſtance of Adrian's juſtice, ſome have fondly believed that he himſelf was a Chriſtian; but can we ſuppoſe that he, who built a temple to Antinous, would raiſe another to Jeſus Chriſt?

Marcus Aurelius ordained, that the Chriſtians ſhould not be perſecuted on the ſcore of religion; and they were openly protected by Caracalla, Heliogabalus, Alexander, Philippus, and Gallienus: they had all this time, therefore, to extend and fortify their infant-church; they held five councils in the firſt century, ſixteen in the ſecond, and ſix and thirty in the third. We learn from the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, that, even at this period, the altars were extremely magnificent: that ſome of them were adorned with columns of ſilver, weighing together three thouſand marks: that the chalices were made after the model of the Roman cups, and the patens, or covers, of beaten gold. The Chriſtians enjoyed ſuch uncommon indulgences, in ſpite of the clamour and perſecuting ſpirit of their enemies, that, in ſeveral provinces, they had churches built upon the ruins of heathen temples, which had been demoliſhed. This circumſtance is owned by Origen and St. Cyprian; and the church muſt have long enjoyed uninterrupted peace, ſeeing theſe two great men already reproached their cotemporaries with luxury, effeminacy, and avarice, the conſequences of affluence and repoſe. St. Cyprian expreſsly complains, that divers biſhops, neglecting the holy examples they had before their eyes, "accumulated great ſums of money,

" ney, enriched themſelves by uſury, and obtained eſ-
" tates by fraud:" Theſe are his very words; an evident proof of the happy tranquillity they enjoyed under the Roman laws. The abuſe of any thing plainly demonſtrates the exiſtence of it.

The perſecution of the Chriſtians under Decius, Maximin, and Diocleſian, was founded on reaſons of ſtate. Decius hated them becauſe they favoured the family of Philippus, ſuſpected, though erroneouſly, of being a Chriſtian himſelf: Maximin perſecuted them becauſe they ſupported Gordianus; but they enjoyed the moſt extenſive liberty, for a ſeries of twenty years, in the reign of Diocleſian. At length, in the year 303, Cæſar Galerius, their inveterate enemy, perſuaded Diocleſian to give orders for demoliſhing the cathedral of Nicomedia, which was built oppoſite to the emperor's palace: a Chriſtian tore the edict in public, and was puniſhed for his preſumption. In a few days after this incident, part of the palace of Galerius was deſtroyed by fire; and the Chriſtians were accuſed as the incendiaries: nevertheleſs they were not condemned to the pains of death; it was only decreed, that their churches and books ſhould be burnt, and that their perſons ſhould be deprived of all dignity. 'Till that time, Diocleſian never had the leaſt intention to lay them under conſtraint in matters of religion; he had, after his victory over the Perſians, iſſued edicts againſt the Manicheans, who were attached to the intereſts of Perſia, and ſecret enemies to the Roman empire. Reaſons of ſtate were the ſole cauſe of theſe edicts. Had they been dictated by religious zeal, a kind of zeal with which conquerors are very ſeldom inſpired, the Chriſtians would have been included; but they were not: of conſequence they had twenty years complete to ſtrengthen their intereſt, under this very Diocleſian, and were not maltreated, except during two years of his reign; beſides, Lactantius, Euſebius, and the emperor Conſtantine himſelf, impute theſe violences to Galerius alone, and not to Diocleſian. Indeed it is not at all probable, that a man who had philoſophy enough to renounce the empire, ſhould ſhew ſo little as to become a a fanatic perſecutor. Diocleſian is, for the moſt part,

ignorantly repreſented as an enemy ever in arms againſt the faithful, and his reign as a continual maſſacre; but nothing can be more contrary to truth. The æra of martyrs, which begins at his acceſſion, ſhould not therefore have commenced 'till two years before his abdication; for no perſon ſuffered martyrdom during the firſt twenty years of his reign.

The ſtory of his having quitted the empire out of vexation, becauſe he had not been able to aboliſh Chriſtianity, is a contemptible fiction: had he been really ſucha perſecutor, he would, on the contrary, have continued to reign, that he might have had an opportunity to deſtroy it in earneſt; and if he was compelled to abdicate, as it is alledged without any ſort of proof, he did not quit the reigns of government through chagrin or regret. The vain pleaſure of recording extraordinary incidents, and increaſing the number of martyrs, has induced many writers to add falſe and incredible perſecutions to thoſe that were but too true. They pretend, that under the reign of Dioclefian, in the year 297, Maximan Herculus Cæſar doomed to martyrdom the whole Theban legion, conſiſting of ſix thouſand, ſix hundred Chriſtians, who were ſent into the midſt of the Alps, where they allowed themſelves to be maſſacred, without murmuring at their fate. This ſtory, ſo much celebrated, was not written till near two hundred years after the ſuppoſed event, by the abbot Eukerus, who related it from hear-ſay. Granting there actually was ſuch a legion as the Theban, or Thebean, a circumſtance that is very doubtful, is it probable that Maximan Herculus ſhould, as is reported, recal them from the Eaſt to appeaſe a ſedition which happened among the Gauls? wherefore ſhould he deprive himſelf of ſix thouſand, ſix hundred good ſoldiers, for whom he had immediate occaſion, to quell this ſedition?. how happened they to be all Chriſtians without exception? wherefore murder them in the route? who were the perſons by whom they ſuffered martyrdom*? to what purpoſe ſhould this butchery

* Nothing can be more frivolous than this way of reaſoning: if we allow that Maximan was an implacable enemy to the Chriſtians,

butchery be acted, at a time when there was no perſecution, at an æra when the church enjoyed the moſt profound tranquillity, when under the very eye of Dioclesian, even in Nicomedia, oppoſite to his own palace, the Chriſtians had built a ſuperb cathedral? "The pro-"found peace and perfect liberty which we enjo," (ſays Euſebius) "is the occaſion of our becoming remiſs in "our duty." Is this profound peace, this perfect liberty, conſiſtent with the maſſacre of ſix thouſand, ſix hundred ſoldiers? if this incredible fact had been true, would Euſebius have paſſed it over in ſilence? So many true martyrs have ſealed the goſpel with their blood, that their glory ought not to be ſhared with thoſe who did not ſhare their ſufferings; certain it is, Dioclesian, in the two laſt years of his reign, and Galerius, for ſome years after, perſecuted with great violence, the Chriſtians of Aſia Minor and the neighbouring countries. But in Spain, Gaul, and England, which were then in the diviſion of Conſtantius Chlorus, far from being proſcribed, they ſaw their religion the prevailing faith; and Euſebius ſays, that Maxentius, who was elected emperor at Rome in the year 306, perſecuted no perſon *.

tians, the ſteps he took for their deſtruction were by no means abſurd. The pretence of a ſedition in Gaul afforded an excuſe for bringing them into a part of the world where his own influence chiefly predominated. It is very natural to ſuppoſe, that the Chriſtians were incorporated into one body; they themſelves would deſire to be united; or, if the emperor was reſolved to cut them off, this was the moſt feaſible way of doing it at once. Nor is there any improbability in the ſtory of their being maſſacred on their route: no method could be better contrived for their deſtruction than that of falling upon them on a long march, among mountains and defiles, where they were fatigued, bewildered, divided, and incapable of ſuſtaining one another.

* The hatred which Dioclesian conceived againſt the Chriſtians, in the latter part of his reign, was ſo violent, that he did all in his power to extinguiſh their religion in Europe as well as in Aſia. In Spain we ſtill find the remains of trophies erected to him, with inſcriptions to this effect: "For having extended the Roman empire in the Eaſt and Weſt; for having extinguiſhed the name of Chriſtians, who diſturbed the quiet of the commonwealth; for having aboliſhed their ſuperſtition in all parts of the earth, and augmented the worſhip of the gods." His edicts againſt the Chriſtians

The Chriſtians effectually ſerved Conſtantius Chlorus, whoſe wife Helena publickly embraced their religion; then they formed a conſiderable party in the ſtate. Their money and their arms contributed largely in raiſing Conſtantine to the purple; for this reaſon they became odious to the ſenate and people of Rome, as well as to the prætorian cohorts, who univerſally declared for Maxentius, his competitor for the empire. Our hiſtorians ſtigmatize Maxentius with the name of tyrant, becauſe he was unfortunate; certain it is, however, he was the true emperor, as having been proclaimed by the ſenate and people of Rome.

The reign of Conſtantine is a glorious æra for religion, which it crowned with triumph. There was no occaſion to intermingle prodigies, ſuch as the apparition of the Labarum in the clouds, without once mentioning in what country that ſtandard appeared: there was no neceſſity to relate that the guards of the Labarum* were invulnerable. The ſhield of Egeria that fell from heaven in antient Rome, the oriflame brought to St. Denis by an angel, and all ſuch imitations of the Palladium of Troy, ſerve only to debaſe truth with an air of fiction. Divers learned antiquaries have ſufficiently refuted theſe errors, which philoſophy diſavows, and which true criticiſm

tians were ſeverely executed even in Britain; a great number of Britiſh martyrs ſuffered under this perſecution. We are informed by Gildas, the Britiſh hiſtorian, that many Chriſtians were put to death in this iſland by a variety of tortures: that many fled from the perſecution to woods and deſarts, where they lay concealed in ſequeſtered caves. Among thoſe who ſuffered was the famous St. Alban, who had been converted from paganiſm by a prieſt to whom he afforded ſhelter in the time of the perſecution.

* The derivation of the word Labarum is not known; it was the appellation given to the famous ſtandard of Conſtantine made in conſequence of a viſion. As he marched at the head of his army from Gaul towards Italy, he is ſaid to have ſeen the ſign of the croſs in the clouds, formed by the two initial letters of our Saviour's name, according to the Greek orthography; and over it theſe words, "In hoc ſigno vinces." Euſebius ſaw the ſtandard and the croſs, which is exhibited in this manner ; and the miraculous effects of it he learned from the emperor's mouth.

ticiſm muſt always deſtroy. Let us confine our attention to a view of thoſe incidents, in conſequence of which Rome ceaſed to be the metropolis of the empire.

Conſtantine, who was elevated to the Imperial throne againſt the inclinations of the Romans, could not be agreeable to that people. It is very evident, that the murder of Licinius, his brother-in-law, in violation of the moſt ſolemn oaths; the death of Licinianus, his nephew, murdered at twelve years of age; the fate of his father-in-law, Maximian, butchered by his order at Marſeilles; of his own ſon Criſpus, whom he put to death, after he had gained him ſeveral battles; and of his wife Fauſta, ſtifled in a hot bath; muſt have created an abhorrence, which could not allay the hatred of his ſubjects *. And this is probably the reaſon that induced him to tranſlate the ſeat of empire to Byzantium. We find, in the code of Theodoſius, an edict of Conſtantine, in which he declares, that he founded Conſtantinople by

* This is a very invidious and unjuſt repreſentation of facts, calculated to aſperſe the memory of a great prince, who has been ſo remarkably celebrated for his generoſity, good-nature, and moderation. Licinius was not put to death in violation of oaths. He had fought four battles with Conſtantine who was his benefactor: he had infringed the treaty by which peace was re-eſtabliſhed, and renewed the war: he was at length cooped up in the city of Nicomedia; and ſeeing no poſſibility of eſcaping, he threw himſelf at the feet of the victor. Conſtantine received him with great tenderneſs, and ſent him to Theſſalonica, with an aſſurance that he ſhould live unmoleſted, ſo long as he ſhould refrain from intrigues againſt the ſtate. Notwithſtanding this indulgence, he began to tamper with the Barbarians, in hope of exciting a new revolt; and Conſtantine, being informed of his cabals, cauſed him to be ſtrangled in order to prevent another civil war. As for Maximian, he was not put to death, until he attempted, in the moſt treacherous manner, to aſſaſſinate the emperor in his own palace, after he had once rebelled, been defeated, and generouſly pardoned. Conſtantine's ſon Criſpus was ſacrificed to his jealouſy, in conſequence of a falſe accuſation by the empreſs Fauſta, who charged Criſpus with an attempt upon her chaſtity; ſhe was afterwards convicted of perfidy, and juſtly ſuffered death. The death of young Licinianus, indeed, is not to be excuſed, nor accounted for, but from reaſons of ſtate. There is no character ſo bright, as to be altogether without blemiſh; but that of Conſtantine is juſtly revered as a pattern of mercy and benevolence."

the expreſs command of God: thus, in order to ſilence the murmurs of his people, he feigned a revelation. This ſingle circumſtance is ſufficient to make us acquainted with his real character. Our greedy curioſity would fain penetrate through the interior receſſes in the heart of a man like Conſtantine, who, in a little time, altered the œconomy of the Roman empire; the reſidence of the ſovereign, the manners of the court, the cuſtoms, language, apparel, government, and religion. How ſhall we diſcern the real character of a prince, whom one party has deſcribed as the moſt criminal, and the other as the moſt virtuous of mankind? If we ſuppoſe he made every thing ſubſervient to what he thought his own intereſt, we ſhould not be miſtaken.*

To know whether the ruin of the empire was really owing to Conſtantine, will be an inquiry, in all reſpects, worthy of your underſtanding. It plainly appears that he was the ruin of Rome: but, in tranſporting the throne to the Thracian Boſphorus, he formed in the Eaſt conſiderable barriers againſt the irruption of thoſe barbarians, who in the reigns of his ſucceſſors, deluged Europe, and found Italy without defence: he ſeems to have ſacrificed the Weſt as a victim for the Eaſt. Italy fell when Conſtantinople aroſe. The political hiſtory of thoſe times would be a ſtudy at once curious and inſtructive: at preſent, in lieu of hiſtory, we have ſcarce any thing but ſatire and panegyric. Even by means of panegyric we are ſometimes enabled to inveſtigate the truth. Conſtantine, for example, is extolled to the ſkies, for having expoſed to wild beaſts, in the Circus, all the chiefs of the Franks, and the priſoners he took in an expedition to the Rhine: ſuch was the treatment offered to the predeceſſors of Clovis and Charlemagne †.

The

* The human mind is very capable of ſentiments and deſigns that cannot be reduced to this narrow ſtandard: but this is a truth, which, to ſordid ſouls, is altogether incomprehenſible.

† It was abſolutely neceſſary to practiſe uncommon ſeverity againſt thoſe barbarians, who were bound by no treaties, and reſtrained by no ſentiment of humanity. They made continual irruptions into the empire, ravaging the country with fire and ſword, and

The writers who have been ſo baſe as to applaud cruel actions, have at leaſt eſtabliſhed the facts, and ſenſible readers judge of them by the light of their own underſtanding. The moſt circumſtantial part in the hiſtory of this revolution, is that which relates to the eſtabliſhment of the Church, and the troubles to which ſhe was expoſed.

It is a melancholy reflection, that ſcarce had the chriſtian religion aſcended the throne, than the holineſs of it was profaned by Chriſtians unworthy of the name, who blindly followed the dictates of revenge, even at a time when their triumph over all their enemies ought to have inſpired them with the ſpirit of peace. In Syria and Paleſtine, they maſſacred all the magiſtrates who had been ſevere in executing the laws againſt them: they drowned the wife and daughter of Maximin, and his ſons and relations periſhed by the moſt cruel torments. The diſputes about the conſubſtantiability of the word involved mankind in confuſion and bloodſhed: in a word, Ammianus Marcellinus ſays, that the Chriſtians of his time attacked one another like wild beaſts. Great virtues they, doubtleſs, had, of which Ammianus has taken no notice: theſe are always concealed from the eyes of an enemy, while one's vices appear in the moſt conſpicuous point of view.

The church of Rome was preſerved from theſe crimes and misfortunes: at firſt, ſhe had neither power nor blemiſh, but remained a long time quiet and diſcreet in the midſt of an idolatrous ſenate and people. In that capital of the known world were ſeven hundred temples, great and ſmall, dedicated to the gods "majorum et "minorum gentium." Theſe ſubſiſted even to the reign of Theodoſius; and long after him, the people of the country perſiſted in their antient worſhip. Hence

and committing the moſt ſavage acts of cruelty and outrage. They were brutal as the beaſts of the field, and deſervedly hunted down as the common enemies of mankind. After all, their puniſhment was not more ſevere than that which our laws inflict upon thoſe unhappy wretches who are convicted of riſing in arms againſt the eſtabliſhed government, even when miſled by miſtaken notions of loyalty, or exaſperated by oppreſſion and deſpair.

the followers of the old religion acquired the appellation of Pagans, or Pagani, from the little towns called Pagi, where idolatry was allowed to ſubſiſt even to the eighth century.

We know very well the impoſture on which Conſtantine's donation is founded: but we cannot conceive how ſuch an impoſture ſhould have been ſo long credited: thoſe who denied it, were frequently puniſhed in Italy and in other countries. Who, for example, could imagine that even ſo late as the year 1478, divers perſons ſhould have been committed to the flames for having oppoſed this error* ?

Conſtantine certainly granted, not to the biſhop of Rome only, but to the cathedral, which was the church of St. John, one thouſand marks of gold, and thirty thouſand of ſilver, with fourteen thouſand ſols annually, and certain lands in Calabria: this patrimony was augmented by every ſucceeding emperor; and the biſhops of Rome ſtood in need of ſuch aſſiſtance. The miſſionaries whom they ſent into thoſe parts of Europe where the Pagan worſhip prevailed, the biſhops expelled from their ſees, to whom they afforded an aſylum, and the great number of poor whom they maintained, abſolutely required very great revenues. The credit of the rank, which was ſuperior to all wealth, ſoon rendered the paſtor of the Chriſtians at Rome, the moſt conſiderable man of the weſtern world. True piety condeſcended to accept of this miniſtry, but ambition intrigued

* Conſtantine is ſaid to have made a donation to pope Sylveſter, of the city of Rome, together with ſeveral provinces of Italy. This pretended donation is firſt mentioned by Hincmar, archbiſhop of Rheims, who lived in the ninth century; and Pope Leo IX. gives an account of it in a letter, which he wrote in the eleventh century, to Michael, patriarch of Conſtantinople. It has, however, been proved a forgery beyond all contradiction. In the beginning of the ſixteenth century, pope Julius II. demanding of Donato, the Venetian ambaſſador, a ſight of the charter by which the republic claimed the dominion of the Adriatic ſea; that ambaſſador replied, "If your holineſs will pleaſe to ſend for the original donation that Conſtantine made to pope Sylveſter, of the city of Rome, and the other territories belonging to the Church, you will find, on the back of it, a grant of the Adriatic ſea in favour of the Venetians."

trigued for it; ſo that the papal chair became the ſubject of violent diſputes: even as early as the middle of the fourth century, the conſul Prætextatus, who was a heathen, ſaid in the year 466, "If you will make me "biſhop of Rome, I will make myſelf a Chriſtian."

Nevertheleſs, this biſhop had no other power but what aroſe from his perſonal virtue, credit, or intrigue, in favourable conjunctures. No paſtor of the church ever enjoyed any civil juriſdiction, much leſs the rights of regality. Not one of them had what is called the jus terrendi, neither the right of territory, nor the power of pronouncing, "do, dico, abdico." The emperors ſtill continued the ſupreme judges in every thing, but points of doctrine. They even convoked councils. At Nice, Conſtantine received and determined the mutual complaints and accuſations which the biſhops brought againſt each other. The title of ſovereign pontiff was ſtill attached to the empire. When the Goths took poſſeſſion of Rome after the Heruli, when the famous Theodoric, not leſs powerful than Charlemagne was in the ſequel, had eſtabliſhed the ſeat of his empire at Ravenna, in the beginning of the ſixth century, without arrogating to himſelf the title of emperor of the Weſt, which it was in his power to aſſume; he exerciſed over the Romans preciſely the ſame power which the Cæſars had enjoyed: he preſerved the ſenate; he allowed liberty of conſcience; the orthodox Chriſtians, Arians, and Idolaters, were equally ſubject to the civil laws: he judged the Goths, by the Gothic, the Romans by the Roman law: he preſided by his commiſſaries at the elections of biſhops: he prohibited ſimony, and appeaſed ſchiſms. When two popes diſputed the epiſcopal chair, he appointed Symmachus; and this very Symmachus being accuſed, he tried him by his "Miſſi Dominici."

His ſon Atalric regulated the elections of the popes, as well as of all the other metropolitans in his different kingdoms, by an edict that was always obſerved; an edict which was digeſted by his miniſter Caſſiodorus, who afterwards retired to Monte Caſſino, and embraced the rule of St. Benedict; an edict to which Pope John II.

ſubmitted without heſitation. When Beliſarius came to Italy, and reduced it under the imperial power, it is well known that he baniſhed Pope Silverius, and in so doing did not exceed the bounds of his authority, though perhaps he tranſgreſſed the rules of juſtice. Beliſarius, and afterwards Narſes, having reſcued Rome from the yoke of the Goths, Italy was deluged by other barbarians, ſuch as the Gepidæ, Franks, and Germans. The whole weſtern empire was ravaged and became a prey to ſavage nations. The Lombards extended their dominion through all that was called "Italia Citerior." Albonin, the founder of that new dynaſty, was no other than a barbarous free-booter; but the victors ſoon adopted the manners, politeneſs, language, and religion of the vanquiſhed. This was not the caſe with the first Franks and the Burgundians, who brought into Gaul their own unpoliſhed language, and their manners that were ſtill more ruſtic.

The Lombard nation was at firſt compoſed of Pagans and Arians. About the year 640, their king Rotharis publiſhed an edict, granting liberty of conſcience to the profeſſors of all religions; ſo that in almoſt every town of Italy, there was a Catholic biſhop and an Arian biſhop, who allowed the Idolaters, ſtill ſcattered among the villages, to live in quiet.

The kingdom of Lombardy extended from Piedmont to Brindiſi, and the territory of Otranto; it comprehended Beneventum, Bari, and Tarentum; but did not include Apuglia, Rome, nor Ravenna. Theſe countries ſtill remained annexed to the feeble empire of the Eaſt. The church of Rome had therefore been transferred from the dominion of the Goths to that of the Greeks. An exarch governed Rome in the name of the emperor: but he did not reſide in that city, which was almoſt quite abandoned to her own will. His reſidence was at Ravenna, from whence he ſent his orders to the duke or præfect of Rome, and to the ſenators, who were ſtill honoured with the name of "Patres conſcripti." The form of the municipal government ſtill ſubſiſted in this antient capital, ſo deplorably fallen to decay; and the republican ſpirit was never quite extinguiſhed.

guiſhed. Theſe principles were ſuſtained by the example of Venice, a republic firſt founded by fear and miſery, and in a little time raiſed by courage and commerce. Venice was already ſo powerful, that even in the eighth century, ſhe re-eſtabliſhed the exarch Scholaſticus, who had been expelled from Ravenna.

What then was the ſituation of Rome, in the ſeventh and eighth centuries? that of an unfortunate city, very ill defended by the exarchs, continually expoſed to the threats of the Lombards, and ever acknowledging the power of the emperors. The credit of the popes increaſed in the deſolation of the city; they often acted as its fathers and comforters, but always as ſubjects; they could not even be conſecrated without the expreſs permiſſion of the exarch. The forms in which this permiſſion was demanded and granted, are preſerved to this day. The Roman clergy wrote to the metropolitan of Ravenna, ſoliciting the interceſſion of his beatitude with the governor: the pope afterwards ſent his profeſſion of faith to the metropolitan.

Aſtolphus, king of Lombardy, at length made himſelf maſter of the whole exarchate of Ravenna, in the year 751, and put an end to that imperial viceroyalty, which had ſubſiſted one hundred and eighty-three years. As the duchy of Rome depended on the exarchate of Ravenna, Aſtolphus laid claim to Rome, by right of conqueſt: then pope Stephen II. the ſole defender of the unhappy Romans, demanded ſuccour of the emperor Conſtantine, ſurnamed Copronimus. All the aſſiſtance which this miſerable emperor ſent, was an officer of the palace, with a letter to the Lombard king. This weakneſs of the Greek emperors, was the real origin of the new weſtern empire, as well as of the papal greatneſs.

CHAP. VI.

Source of the PAPAL POWER.

ROME, ſo often ſacked by Barbarians, abandoned by the emperors, hard preſſed by the Lombards, and incapable of reſtoring the antient republic, could no longer

longer pretend to greatneſs. It was abſolutely neceſſary, however, that ſhe ſhould enjoy ſome quiet. This bleſſing ſhe might have taſted, could ſhe have been at that time wholly governed by her biſhop, as were ſo many towns of Germany in the ſequel; and this benefit at leaſt would anarchy have produced: but the Chriſtians had not yet imbibed the opinion, that a biſhop could be inveſted with the ſovereign power, though in the hiſtory of mankind we find ſo many examples of the prieſthood's being united with the ſecular power in other religions.

Pope Gregory III. was the firſt who had recourſe to the protection of the Franks, againſt the Lombards and the emperors. His ſucceſſor Zacharias, animated with the ſame ſpirit, acknowledged Pepin *, who uſurped the kingdom of France, as a lawful king. It is pretended that Pepin, while he was yet no more than prime miniſter, deſired to know of the pope who was the true king, he who had nothing but the right and title, or he who had the merit and authority: and that his holineſs decided in favour of the miniſter. It has never been clearly proved that this farce was really acted; but certain it is, pope Stephen III. called on Pepin, to his aſſiſtance againſt the Lombards; that he actually came to France, and in the church of St. Denis, gave the royal unction to Pepin, who was the firſt anointed ſovereign in Europe †. This firſt uſurper not only received the ſacred unction of the pope, after having

* Pepin, ſurnamed The Short, or the Dwarf, on account of his diminutive ſtature, was the ſon of Charles Martel, and firſt miniſter to Childeric III. a weak prince, whom he depoſed, and confined in a convent.

† This pontiff is generally known by the name of pope Stephen II. becauſe his predeceſſor of the ſame name did not live above three or four days after his elevation to the pontificate: he was driven from Italy by Aſtolphus, king of Lombardy, and fled for protection to Pepin, whom he conſecrated in the abbey of St. Denis. While he continued in that place he was ſeized with a dangerous diſorder, and cauſed himſelf to be carried under the bells of the church, where he demanded of God the reſtoration of his health: and, as he himſelf writes, was cured by the interceſſion of St. Denis, whom he ſaw in a viſion ſtanding between St. Peter and St. Paul.

having received it from St. Boniface who was called the apoſtle of Germany*; but Stephen III. forbade the French, on pain of excommunication, to beſtow it on the kings of any other race. When this biſhop, an exile from his own country, and ſuppliant in a foreign land, had the courage to give laws to his protectors, his policy aſſumed an authority which ſecured that of his benefactor; and Pepin, that he might the more ſafely enjoy that which was not his due, allowed the pope to poſſeſs thoſe rights to which he had no title.

Hugh Capet in France, and Conrad in Germany, ſhewed in the ſequel, that this excommunication is not a fundamental law. Nevertheleſs, opinion, which governs mankind, at firſt imprinted in their hearts ſuch reverence for this ceremony, which was performed by the pope at St. Denis, that Eginhar, ſecretary to Charlemagne, expreſsly declared that king Hilderic was depoſed by order of pope Stephen. It will be thought a contradiction that this pope ſhould come to proſtrate himſelf at the feet of Pepin, and afterwards diſpoſe of the crown; but, in fact, it is no contradiction. Such proſtrations were then conſidered in the ſame light as our preſent ceremony or compliment of bowing. It was the antient cuſtom of the Eaſt: biſhops were ſaluted on the bended knee, and this ſame reſpect they did pay to the governors of their dioceſes. Charles, the ſon of Pepin, had embraced the feet of pope Stephen at St. Maurice in Vallais; and Stephen, in his turn, embraced thoſe of Pepin. All this was a matter of no conſequence: but the popes by little and little arrogated to themſelves only this mark of reſpect. Pope Adrian I. is ſaid to have

* This holy man was an Engliſhman, a native of the place which is now Exeter. When he was turned of thirty, he left England, in order to preach the goſpel among barbarous nations. His original name of Winfrid was converted into Boniface, by pope Gregory II. under whoſe auſpices he eſtabliſhed the faith of Chriſt in many different countries of Germany. He was promoted to the ſee of Mentz, which was erected into an archbiſhoprick; but in a little time he reſigned it to his diſciple Lullius, with the conſent of king Pepin. Then he retired to Utrecht, that he might be at liberty to preach the goſpel in Frieſland, where he was murdered by the Pagans, in the year 754.

have been the pontiff who ordained that nobody ſhould appear before him without kiſſing his feet. Emperors and kings ſubmitted like perſons of inferior ſtation to this ceremony, which rendered the Roman religion more venerable in the eyes of mankind *.

We are told, that in the year 754, Pepin paſſed the Alps; that Aſtolphus, king of Lombardy, was ſo intimidated by the ſole preſence of the Frank, that he immediately ceded the whole exarchate of Ravenna to the pope: then Pepin repaſſed the mountains; but ſcarce was he returned, when Aſtolphus, inſtead of giving up Ravenna to the pope, undertook the ſiege of Rome. All the tranſactions of thoſe times were ſo irregular, that Pepin certainly might have given to the popes the exarchate of Ravenna, though it did not belong to him; and even made this ſingular donation, without taking any ſtep to render it effectual. Yet it is very unlikely, that a man of Pepin's diſpoſition, who had dethroned his own ſovereign, ſhould march with an army into Italy, for no other purpoſe but to make preſents †. Nothing can be more doubtful than this donation, which is mentioned in ſo many books. The librarian Anaſtaſius, who wrote 140 years after Pepin's expedition, is the firſt who takes notice of it. A thouſand authors have quoted it ſince that period; but it is now refuted by the beſt caſuiſts in Germany.

At that time the human mind was poſſeſſed by a capricious medley of cunning and ſimplicity, of brutality and artifice, which was a ſtrong characteriſtic of general decay and degeneracy. Stephen forged a letter in the name

* Though genuflexion and proſtration may be the common methods of ſalutation in China, and ſome other parts of the Eaſt, they were always deemed marks of humiliation or adoration in Europe. It was very natural for pope Stephen to proſtrate himſelf as a ſupplicating exile before a prince whoſe protection was ſo neceſſary towards his re-eſtabliſhment: nor is it ſurpriſing, that Charles, the ſon of Pepin, ſhould have kiſſed the feet of a pretended apoſtle, and even paid adoration to him whom he ſuppoſed the immediate repreſentative and vicar of Jeſus Chriſt.

† Nothing is more probable, than that Pepin, as a political prince, ſhould be at ſome pains to ſupport and aggrandize the pope, who had ſanctified his own uſurpation.

name of St. Peter, addreſſed from heaven to Pepin and his children, which for its oddity deſerves to he literally inſerted. "Peter, called an apoſtle by Jeſus Chriſt, the ſon of the living God, &c. As by me, the catholic, apoſtolic, Roman church, mother of all other churches, is founded on a rock; and to the end that the grace of our Lord be fully granted to Stephen, biſhop of that ſweet and holy Roman church, whereby he may preſerve her from the hands of her perſecutors. To you the moſt excellent monarchs, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman: and to all holy biſhops and abbots, prieſts and monks; and even to dukes, counts, and peoples, I Peter, apoſtle, &c. I conjure you, and the Virgin Mary, who will be much obliged to you, gives you to underſtand, and commands you as well as the thrones, dominions—if you do not fight for me, I declare by the holy trinity, and my own apoſtleſhip, that you ſhall never enjoy any part of Paradiſe." This letter had the deſired effect. Pepin paſſed the Alps a ſecond time, beſieged Pavia, and then concluded a peace with Aſtolphus. But is it probable that he ſhould croſs the mountains twice, with no other view but that of beſtowing towns upon pope Stephen? why does not St. Peter mention ſuch an important fact in his letter? why does not he complain to Pepin that he was not in poſſeſſion of the exarchate? why does not he expreſsly demand that it ſhould be reſtored?

The original title of this donation never appeared: we are therefore obliged to doubt its authenticity. To this dilemma we are often reduced in hiſtory, as well as in philoſophy. Beſides, the holy ſee has no occaſion for equivocal titles. The right ſhe has to her territories are as inconteſtible as thoſe that any other ſovereigns of Europe have to their reſpective dominions. Certain it is, the pontiffs of Rome, even then, had large patrimonies, in more than one country: theſe patrimonies were always reſpected, and totally exempt from tribute. They had territories among the Alps, in Tuſcany, at Spoletto, in Gaul, Sicily, and even in Corſica, before the Arabians made themſelves maſters of that iſland in the eighth century. Probably Pepin conſiderably augmented this patrimony in the

the country of Romagna, and this was called the patrimony of the exarchate. The word Patrimony was, in all likelihood, the ſource of the miſtake. Authors of a latter date, who wrote in times of obſcurity, took it for granted, that the popes had actually reigned in every country, where they only poſſeſſed ſome towns and territories.

The only pope, who, towards the latter end of the eighth century, ſeems to have raiſed himſelf to the rank of prince, was Adrian I. The money coined in his name, if that coin was really ſtruck in his name, plainly ſhews that he poſſeſſed the rights of ſovereignty; and the cuſtom of kiſſing feet, which he introduced, ſerves to ſtrengthen this conjecture; and yet he always acknowledged the Greek emperor as his ſovereign. He might very well pay an unſubſtantial homage to that diſtant ſovereign, and at the ſame time arrogate to himſelf a real independance, ſupported by the authority of his ſacred function.

Before we view in what manner the whole face of affairs was changed in the Weſt, by the tranſlation of the empire, it will be neceſſary to give you an idea of the ſtate of the eaſtern church, the diſpute of which contributed not a little to that great revolution.

CHAP. VII.

STATE of the EASTERN CHURCH, before CHARLEMAGNE.

THAT the cuſtoms of the Greek and Latin churches were as different as their languages; that the liturgy, the veſtments, the ornaments, the form of the churches, and even of the croſs, were not the ſame in both; that the Greeks prayed ſtanding, and the Latins on their knees, are points which I ſhall not examine. It was to other cauſes than this difference of modes, that we muſt impute the quarrels that embroiled the eaſt and weſtern parts of the world. Theſe ſerved only to nouriſh the natural averſion of two nations, become rivals to each other. The Greeks eſpecially, who never

never received baptiſm but by immerſion, plunging themſelves into baptiſmal tubs, hated the Latins, who, in favour of the northern Chriſtians, introduced that rite by aſperſion. But theſe cuſtoms excited no dangerous convulſions.

Temporal dominion, that eternal ſubject of diſcord in the Weſt, was unknown to the eaſtern churches. The biſhops remained in the capacity of ſubjects, under the eyes of a maſter. But other quarrels, no leſs miſchievous, were excited by thoſe interminable diſputes that ſpring from the ſpirit of ſophiſtry, which predominated among the Greeks and their diſciples. The ſimplicity of the firſt ages was loſt in the great number of queſtions formed by human curioſity: for the founder of the faith having committed nothing to writing, and mankind being deſirous of knowing every thing, each myſtery produced different opinions, and every opinion was ſealed with blood.

It is very remarkable, that of near fourſcore ſects which have haraſſed the church ſince its origin, not one was formed by a Roman, if we except Novatian, who can ſcarce be conſidered as an heretic. Of all the biſhops of Rome, one only favoured any of thoſe ſyſtems which the church condemned; that was pope Honorius I. whom we ſtill hear every day accuſed of having been a Monothelite *, an imputation laid on purpoſe to blaſt the memory of that pontiff; but whoever will give himſelf the trouble to read his famous paſtoral letter, in which he attributes only one will to Jeſus Chriſt, will find him a man of extraordinary ſagacity: "We confeſs (ſays he) one only will in Jeſus Chriſt; we do not ſee that the councils or ſcripture authoriſe us to eſpouſe any other opinion: but, to know whether, on account of the works of divinity and humanity that are in him, we ought to underſtand one operation or two, is a point I leave

* Monothelites were hereticks, ſo called becauſe they admitted but one will in Jeſus Chriſt. This doctrine was firſt broached about the year 620, by Theodore, biſhop of Pharan. It was formerly condemned in the third council of Conſtantinople, in the year 680, and the author and favourers of it were anathematized.

leave to grammarians, as a matter of very little importance."

Perhaps there is nothing more valuable than thefe words, in all the letters of the popes, now extant. They convince us, that all the diſputes of the Greeks were diſputes upon words; and that thoſe quarrels of mere ſophiſts which were attended with ſuch fatal conſequences, ought to have been ſtifled in the birth. Had they been left to the deciſion of grammarians, according to the opinion of this ſenſible pontiff, the church would have enjoyed uninterrupted repoſe: but whenever any perſon was deſirous to know whether the Son was conſubſtantial, or like unto the Father, the Chriſtian world was divided, and one half perſecuted the other: was the queſtion to know whether the mother of Jeſus Chriſt was the mother of God, or of Jeſus only? whether Chriſt had two natures and two wills in the ſame perſon, or two perſons and one will, or one will and one perſon? All theſe diſputes, brought forth in Conſtantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, were the ſource of ſedition. One party anathematized another: the domineering faction inflicted the pains of exile, impriſonment, death, and eternal damnation upon their antagoniſts, who avenged themſelves in their turn, by the ſame artillery. Troubles of this nature were unknown in the time of paganiſm, becauſe the heathens, in the midſt of their groſs errors, had no tenets; and the prieſts of the idols (much leſs the laity) never juridically aſſembled on purpoſe to diſpute.

In the eighth century, the churches of the Eaſt deliberated whether it was incumbent on them to worſhip images. This kind of worſhip the law of Moſes had expreſsly forbid: that law had never been annulled; and the primitive Chriſtians, during the two firſt centuries, had never ſuffered images to appear in their aſſemblies. By little and little, it became the faſhion every where for perſons to have crucifixes in their own houſes; afterwards they introduced portraits, whether true or falſe, of the martyrs or confeſſors. As yet there were no altars erected for ſaints, nor maſſes celebrated in their

their names. It was only ſuppoſed, that at ſight of a crucifix or image of a good man, the human heart, which, in thoſe climates eſpecially, has need of ſenſible objects, would be ſtimulated to virtue. This cuſtom was introduced into churches; yet ſome biſhops refuſed to adopt it. We find, that in 393, St. Epiphanius pulled away, from a church in Syria, a certain image before which the people offered their devotion. He declared, that the Chriſtian religion did not allow of ſuch worſhips: yet no ſchiſm was produced from this act of ſeverity.

At length this pious practice, like all other human things, degenerated into abuſe. The populace, ever groſs and ſtupid, did not diſtinguiſh between the real God and images. To theſe, in a little time, they began to attribute virtues and miracles: every image infallibly cured one kind of diſtemper. They were even uſed in ſorcery, which has at all times ſeduced the credulity of the vulgar; I mean, not only the vulgar of the populace, but alſo that of the great and the learned. In the year 727, the emperor Leo the Iſaurian, reſolved, by the perſuaſion of ſome biſhops, to eradicate this abuſe; but, by an abuſe ſtill more flagrant, he ordered all paintings to be deſtroyed; he demoliſhed the ſtatues and repreſentations of Jeſus Chriſt, as well as thoſe of the ſaints: he incenſed the people, by thus at once depriving them of the objects of their worſhip. They diſobeyed his commands, and he raiſed a perſecution. In a word, he became a tyrant, becauſe his conduct had happened to be indiſcreet *.

It

* This Leo was originally a pedlar of Iſauris, and raiſed himſelf to the purple by his military talents. He declared war againſt images, and in particular cauſed to be melted a brazen ſtatute of Jeſus Chriſt, which had been placed over one of the city-gates. This action excited a ſedition, which having quelled, he exerciſed horrible cruelties upon all who worſhipped images. He ordered twelve venerable eccleſiaſtics, whom the emperors had uſed to conſult in affairs of the greateſt conſequence, to be burned in their own houſes in the night, together with all their books, becauſe they would not adopt his opinion. He baniſhed St. Germanus, patriarch of Conſtantinople, for the ſame reaſon. He was excommunicated by

It is a reproach upon this age, that it ſhould produce compilers, who ſtill repeat the old fable of two Jews who predicted to Leo his future greatneſs, and exacted of him, that, on his elevation to the empire, he ſhould aboliſh image-worſhip; as if it had been a matter of any conſequence to the Jews, whether the Chriſtians had or had not figures in their churches. Hiſtorians who believe that perſons can thus prognoſticate what is to happen, are altogether unworthy to record what has paſſed.

His ſon, Conſtantine Copronimus, confirmed the abolition of images, by a civil and eccleſiaſtical conſtitution. He aſſembled at Conſtantinople a council of three hundred and thirty-eight biſhops, who unanimouſly condemned this kind of worſhip, which had been received in many churches, and particularly at Rome.

This emperor would have as willingly aboliſhed the monks, whom he abhorred, and to whom he gave no other appellation than that of abominable wretches; but he could not accompliſh his deſign: the monks, who were already rich, defended their wealth much more dexterouſly, than they had done the images of their ſaints.

The popes Gregory II. and Gregory III. and their ſucceſſors, though ſecretly enemies to the emperors, and openly oppoſed to this doctrine, did not, however, fulminate thoſe ſentences of excommunication, which in the ſequel were ſo frequently and ſo frivolouſly employed. But whether the metropolitans of Rome were ſtill reſtrained by that antient reſpect for the ſucceſſors of the Cæſars, or (which is more probable) that they foreſaw thoſe excommunications, interdictions, and diſpenſations with the oath of allegiance, would be deſpiſed in Conſtantinople, whoſe patriarchal church at leaſt equalled the ſee of Rome; they held two councils in 728 and 732, which determined, that all the enemies of image-worſhip ſhould be barely excommunicated, without

by pope Gregory II. and afterwards pope Gregory III. aſſembled a ſynod at Rome, in the year 732, which paſſed the ſame ſentence upon all thoſe who were enemies to this kind of idolatry.

out once mentioning the emperor. From that period they attended more to buſineſs than to diſpute. Gregory II. aſſumed the adminiſtration of affairs at Rome; while the people, riſing in rebellion againſt the emperor, would no longer pay the uſual tribute. Gregory III. acted on the ſame principles. Some Greek authors of a poſterior date, with a view to blacken the memory of the popes, have affirmed, that Gregory II. excommunicated and depoſed the emperor: and that the whole Roman people acknowledged this pontiff as their ſovereign. Theſe Greeks did not conſider, that the popes, whom they wanted to repreſent as uſurpers, would, in that caſe, have been the moſt lawful of all princes: they would have held their power by the free ſuffrages of the Roman people, and become ſovereigns of Rome by a much juſter title than that of many emperors: but it is neither probable nor true, that the Romans, when threatened by Leo the Iſaurian, and hard preſſed by the Lombards, elected their biſhop as their ſole lord and maſter, at a time when they ſtood in need of the aſſiſtance of warriors. If the popes, at that period, had acquired ſo fair a title to the rank of the Cæſars, they would never have transferred it in the ſequel to Charlemagne *.

CHAP. VIII.

Of CHARLEMAGNE.

THE kingdom of Pepin extended from the Rhine to the Alps and the Pyrenees. Charlemagne, his eldeſt ſon, enjoyed that whole ſucceſſion entire; for one of his brothers died after the diviſion, and the other had,

* This is a very fallacious way of reaſoning. Gregory might have found the burthen too great for his ſhoulders, and therefore reſigned it in favour of a prince who could effectually protect the city. Averſe as an eccleſiaſtic might have been to part with power and title, he would never heſitate when his own immediate ſafety was concerned.

had, before that period, turned monk, in the monaſtery of St. Sylveſter *, a kind of devotion that mingled itſelf with the barbarity of the times, and encloſed more than one prince within a cloiſter: thus Rachis, king of the Lombards, Carloman brother of Pepin, and a duke of Aquitain, had taken the habit of Benedictines: for, at that time, there was hardly any other order in the Weſt. Convents were honourable retreats for thoſe who ſought to lead a life of tranquillity; but theſe ſanctuaries ſoon became the priſons of dethroned princes.

Pepin had not exerciſed a direct ſway in nearly the whole extent of his dominions: he received homage and tribute only from Aquitain, Bavaria, Provence, and Brittany, countries that were newly conquered. This vaſt empire was bounded by two formidable neighbouring nations, namely the northern Germans, and the Saracens. England, conquered by the Anglo-Saxons, divided into an heptarchy, at continual war with Albany, called Scotland, as well as with the Danes, was then deſtitute of power and policy: while Italy, feeble and divided, waited only until it ſhould fall into the hands of ſome new maſter.

The northern Germans were then diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of Saxons, a name that comprehended all thoſe nations which inhabited the banks of the Weſer and the Elb, from Hamburg to Moravia, and from Mentz to the Baltic. They were pagans, as were all the natives of the North; their manners and cuſtoms the ſame as deſcribed in the time of the Romans. Every canton modelled itſelf into a ſeparate republic; but, in time of war, they elected a chief, or general. Their laws were ſimple as their manners, and their religion was brutal. In extreme danger, they, like all other nations, ſacrificed human victims to the divinity; for it is the character of barbarians to believe the Deity is malevolent:

* Pepin, father of Charlemagne, had no other ſon that attained to man's eſtate, but Carloman, king of Auſtraſia, Burgundy, and part of Aquitain; the third ſon, Pepin, died at three years of age. The other children were daughters: conſequently our author muſt be miſtaken.

malevolent: mankind form the idea of a God after their own image. The French, tho' already converted to Chriſtianity, retained this horrible ſuperſtition in the reign of Theodebert. Human victims were ſacrificed in Italy, according to the account given by Procopius; and the Jews had ſometimes committed this kind of ſacrilege, through exceſs of devotion. In other reſpects thoſe people cultivated juſtice, and placed their glory and their happineſs in the enjoyment of liberty. Theſe were the people, who, under the names of Catti, Cheruſci, and Bructeri, had conquered Varus *, and were afterwards ſubdued by Germanicus.

Part of this people, in the fifth century, being invited by the iſlanders of Great-Britain, as auxiliaries againſt the inhabitants of Scotland, ſubdued that part of the iſland which borders upon Scotland, and beſtowed upon it the name of England. They had already viſited it, even in the third century: for, in the reign of Conſtantine, the coaſts of the iſland were called the Saxon ſhore.

Charlemagne, the moſt ambitious, the moſt politic prince, and by far the greateſt warrior of his time, maintained a war for thirty years againſt the Saxons, before they were thoroughly ſubdued. Their county did not then yield thoſe things which now tempt the avarice of conquerors: the rich mines of Goſlar and Friedberg, from whence ſo much ſilver has been extracted, were not yet diſcovered: they were not known till the reign of Henry the Fowler. There was no wealth accumulated by a long ſeries of induſtry; no town worthy of an uſurper's ambition. The ſole aim of conqueſt was to enſlave whole millions of men who ploughed the ground in an unfavourable climate, fed their flocks, and refuſed to ſubmit to the arbitrary will of a maſter.

The

* Quintilius Varus was proconſul of Germany, in the reign of Auguſtus: he was ſurpriſed and cut off, with three legions, by Arminius, chief of the Cheruſci, and the Roman eagles were buried. Auguſtus took this diſgrace ſo much to heart, that he frequently broke forth into the following exclamation: *Redde mihi legiones Quintili Vare.*

The war againſt the Saxons commenced on account of a tribute of three hundred horſes and ſome cows, which Pepin exacted of them; and this war continued thirty years. If it be aſked what right the Franks had over the people? I anſwer, "The ſame right which the Saxons had to England." They muſt have been wretchedly armed; for, in the capitularies of Charlemagne, I find a rigorous prohibition to ſell cuiraſſes to the Saxons. This difference of arms, reinforced by diſcipline, which had enabled the Romans to ſubdue ſo many nations, was likewiſe the great cauſe of Charlemagne's triumphs.

The general over the greater part of theſe nations, was that famous Wittikind *, from whom the chief families of the empire are now ſaid to be deſcended: a man who reſembled Arminius, but who had more weakneſs in his character. Charles at firſt took the famous town of Ereſbourg; for that place neither deſerved the name of a city, nor of a fortreſs. He ordered the inhabitants to be put to the ſword. He pillaged, and afterwards razed to the foundation, the principal temple of the country, formerly built and conſecrated to the god Tantana, the univerſal principle, if ever thoſe ſavages had any idea of an univerſal principle: it was then dedicated to the god Irminſul *, whether this deity was the god of war, the Ares of the Greeks, the Mars of the Romans; or whether it was conſecrated to the famous

* Wittikind, ſurnamed The Great, was ſon of prince Wernikin, head of one of the beſt families among the antient Saxons. He was inveſted with the general command of that people, in their war with Charlemagne, and made incredible efforts of courage and perſeverance againſt that conqueror, who, finding it impracticable to ſubdue his ſpirit, offered reaſonable conditions of peace. Theſe the Saxon accepted, received baptiſm, and was created duke of Saxony. From this prince the reigning family of England deduce their origin.

† Erminſul, or Irminſul, was an idol worſhipped on the mountain of Ereſbourg in Weſtphalia, now called Stadtberg. It is ſuppoſed to have been a repreſentation of Mars, the deity which thoſe warlike people adored. Hence the name of Merſburg, or Hill of Mars, formerly given to the city of Stadtberg.

famous Herman, or Arminius the conqueror of Varus, and the avenger of Germanic liberty.

There the prieſts were maſſacred on the fragments of their idol. The victorious army penetrated as far as the Weſer, and all theſe diſtricts ſubmitted: but Charlemagne wanted to bind them to his yoke by the ties of the Chriſtian religion: while he himſelf haſtened to the other end of his dominions, to gather freſh laurels, he left miſſionaries to convert, and ſoldiers to compel them. Almoſt all that people which lived near the Weſer were, in one year, made Chriſtians and ſlaves.

Wittikind had retired among the Danes, who already trembled for their liberty and their gods; but, at the expiration of ſome years, he returned, re-animated, and re-aſſembled his countrymen. Finding in Bremen, the capital of the country that bears the name, a biſhop, a church, and the Saxons who were dragged in deſpair to new altars, he expelled the prelate, who found means to eſcape and embark. He deſtroyed Chriſtianity, which had been embraced only on compulſion; he advanced to the neighbourhood of the Rhine, at the head of a multitude of Germans, and defeated the lieutenants of Charlemagne.

That prince marched thither with great expedition, and in his turn defeated Wittikind; but he treated this noble effort of liberty as a rebellion. He demanded of the trembling Saxons, that they ſhould deliver up their general; and underſtanding they had allowed him to return to Denmark, he ordered four thouſand five hundred priſoners to be put to the ſword on the banks of the little river Aller. Had thoſe priſoners been really ſubjects in rebellion, this puniſhment would have been horribly ſevere; but, to treat in this manner men who fought for their liberty and laws, was the action of a robber, who in other reſpects appeared a great man, from his illuſtrious atchievements and the moſt ſhining qualifications.

Three other victories were neceſſary to reduce this nation wholly under his yoke. At length Chriſtianity and ſervitude were cemented with blood. Wittikind himſelf, wearied with misfortune, was obliged to re-

ceive baptiſm, and live ever after tributary to his conqueror. The king, the better to ſecure his conqueſt, tranſported Saxon colonies into Italy, and made French ſettlements on the lands of the vanquiſhed; but to this wiſe policy he added the cruelty of ordering his ſpies to ſtab thoſe Saxons who were diſpoſed to return to their own worſhip. We often read of conquerors who were never cruel but in war. Peace is productive of mild laws, and gentle manners. Charlemagne, on the contrary, enacted laws that retained the inhumanity of his conqueſts.

Having ſeen in what manner this conqueror treated the German idolaters, let us now ſee how he behaved with reſpect to the Mahometans of Spain. That had already happened to them, which ſoon after appeared in Germany, France, and Italy. The governors rendered themſelves independent. The emirs of Saragoſſa and Barcelona had put themſelves under the protection of Pepin. In the year 778, the emir of Saragoſſa came to Paderborn, to intreat Charlemagne to ſupport him againſt his ſovereign. The French monarch eſpouſed the cauſe of this Muſſulman; but he took care not to convert him to Chriſtianity. Different intereſts require a difference of conduct. He engaged with an alliance of Saracens againſt Saracens; but, after ſome advantages obtained on the frontiers of Spain, his rear-guard was defeated at Roncevalles, near the Pyrenees, by the very Chriſtians of thoſe mountains, united with the Mahometans. It was here that Orlando, the nephew of Charlemagne, loſt his life*: this misfortune is the ſource of thoſe fables, which a monk, in the eleventh century, wrote in the name of archbiſhop Turpin; fables which were afterwards embelliſhed by the poetical fancy of Arioſto.

* The tomb of Orlando is ſtill ſhewn in the valley of Roncevalles, in the Pyrenees, and a convent is built upon the ſpot. This nobleman is ſaid to have been the ſon of Bertha, ſiſter to Charlemagne; but no ſuch ſiſter is mentioned in hiſtory. Whether there ever was ſuch a perſon as Orlando, is ſtill a queſtion. The extravagant fables of Turpin have, in all probability, given riſe to this doubt; but the world of taſte is highly obliged to the author of thoſe fables, inaſmuch as they gave birth to the Orlando Furioſo, one of the richeſt poems that ever was written.

Arioſto. The preciſe time at which Charles ſuſtained this diſgrace is not known; nor do we find that he ever revenged his defeat. Content with ſecuring his frontiers againſt the attempts of enemies who were but too much inured to war, he graſped at no more than he could retain, and regulated his ambition according to the conjunctures by which it was favoured.

CHAP. IX.

Of CHARLEMAGNE, when raiſed to the IMPERIAL THRONE.

IT was to the poſſeſſion of Rome, and the empire of the Weſt, that his ambition aſpired. The power of the Lombard kings was the ſole obſtacle; the church of Rome, and all the churches under his influence; the monks, who were already powerful, and the people already governed by the monks, concurred in calling Charlemagne to the empire of Rome. Pope Adrian, a native of that city, a man of addreſs and fortitude, paved the way. He at firſt engaged him to repudiate the daughter of Deſiderius, king of Lombardy.

The manners and laws of thoſe times were far from being rigid; at leaſt, with reſpect to princes. Charles had married this daughter of the Lombard king, at a time when he is ſaid to have had another wife alive. Plurality of wives was not at all uncommon. We are told by Gregory of Tours, that the kings Gontran, Corbert, Sigebert, and Chilperic, indulged themſelves in polygamy. Charles repudiated the daughter of Deſiderius, without the leaſt cauſe or formality. The Lombard king no ſooner perceived this fatal union of Charles and the Pope againſt him, than he laid down a courageous reſolution. He determined to ſurprize Rome, and make ſure of the pope's perſon; but the biſhop was dextrous enough to convert the war into a negotiation. Charles ſent ambaſſadors to amuſe and gain time: at length he paſſed the Alps, and Deſiderius was abandoned by part of his own forces. This unfortunate prince

ſhut himſelf up in Pavia, which was his capital; and Charlemagne undertook the ſiege of it in the middle of winter. The city being reduced to extremity, was ſurrendered after a ſiege of ſix months; and all the terms Deſiderius could obtain, were no more than a promiſe that his life would be ſpared. Thus expired the kingdom of the Lombards, who had deſtroyed the Roman power in Italy, and ſubſtituted their own laws in the room of thoſe enacted by the emperors. Deſiderius, the laſt of theſe kings, was conducted into France, and confined in the monaſtery of Corbie, where he lived and died a priſoner and a monk, while his eldeſt ſon made a fruitleſs voyage to Conſtantinople, to ſolicit ſuccours of that phantome of the Roman empire, which had been deſtroyed in the Weſt by his own anceſtors. It muſt be obſerved that Deſiderius was not the only ſovereign whom Charlemagne ſhut up in a cloiſter; in the ſame manner he treated a duke of Bavaria, with his children.

Charlemagne durſt not yet openly aſpire at the ſovereignty of Rome; he aſſumed no more than the title of king of Italy, which the Lombards had enjoyed. In imitation of them, he cauſed himſelf to be crowned in Pavia, with an iron crown, which is ſtill preſerved in the little town of Monza. Juſtice was ſtill adminiſtered at Rome, in the name of the Greek emperor. The popes themſelves received from him the confirmation of their election. Charlemagne, like his father Pepin, took nothing more than the title of Patrician, which Theodoric and Attila had likewiſe deigned to bear: thus, the name of emperor, which originally implied no more than general of an army, ſtill ſignified the maſter of the Eaſt and Weſt. Vain as it was, they ſtill reſpected it, and affected only that of Patrician, which formerly meant a ſenator of Rome.

The popes, who were already very powerful in the church, very high in quality in Rome, and poſſeſſed of large territories, enjoyed but a precarious and tottering authority in that city. The prefect, the people, and the ſenate, whoſe ſhadow ſtill ſubſiſted, frequently roſe againſt

againſt them. The feuds among families that pretended to the pontificate, filled the city of Rome with confuſion.

The two nephews of Adrian conſpired againſt his ſucceſſor Leo III. who was elected pope, according to cuſtom, by the people and clergy of Rome. They charged him with ſundry crimes, and excited the Romans againſt him: They dragged him to priſon, and outrageouſly mangled at Rome the perſon of that very pontiff who was ſo much reſpected in every other place.* He eſcaped, and came to Paderborn, where he threw himſelf at the feet of Charlemagne, the Patrician. That prince, who already acted with abſolute authority, ſent him back with a guard and commiſſioners to ſit upon his trial, who had orders to acquit him of all imputation. At length Charlemagne having rendered himſelf maſter of Italy, as well as of Germany and France, judge of the pope, and arbiter of Europe, arrived at Rome in the latter end of the year 799. At that time, the year, amongſt the Romans, began at Chriſtmas. In the year 800, on Chriſtmas-day, during divine ſervice, Leo III. proclaimed him emperor of the Weſt; and the people joined the ceremony with loud acclamations. Charles affected aſtoniſhment; but nevertheleſs availed himſelf of the authority of his new empire. His right, indeed,

* Paſchal and Campulus, nephews of the late pope Adrian, fell upon Leo with a band of armed men, hard by the monaſtery of St. Stephen and St. Silveſter: they threw him on the ground, where he was ſeverely beaten: then they ſtripped off his veſtments, endeavoured to pull out his eyes and his tongue, dragged him to the altar of the church belonging to the monaſtery, mangled him cruelly with ſtaves and ſwords; and afterwards confined him to a cloſe priſon in the convent of St. Eraſmus. Some authors, fond of prodigies, have aſſerted, that he actually was deprived of his eyes and tongue, but recovered the uſe of both by a miracle. This, however, is a ridiculous fable; for the pope himſelf makes no mention of it in his own account of the adventure. He made ſhift to eſcape from his confinement, by the help of his chamberlain Albin, and Verundus, abbot of Stavelo. Then he was protected by Venegeſus, duke of Spoleto, who marched with an army to his aſſiſtance, and brought him off in triumph from the church of St. Peter, in which he had taken ſanctuary. Thus reſcued, he ſet out for Paderborn in Saxony, where Charlemagne at that time reſided.

was not to be diſputed; ſeeing the ſuffrages of the people are the foundation of all right.

Hiſtorians have aſſerted, and it is aſſerted ſtill, that Charles, even before he was emperor, confirmed the donation of the exarchate of Ravenna, adding thereto Corſica, Sardinia, Liguria, Parma, Mantua, the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, together with Sicily and Venice, and that he depoſited the act of this donation upon the tomb which is ſuppoſed to contain the aſhes of St. Peter and St. Paul.

This donation may be juſtly ranked with that of Conſtantine. It does not appear that the popes ever poſſeſſed any of thoſe countries till the time of Innocent III. Had they enjoyed the exarchate, they muſt have been ſovereigns of Ravenna and Rome; but in the laſt will of Charlemagne, which we find preſerved in Eginhard, that monarch names Rome and Ravenna at the head of the capital cities under his dominion, and bequeaths preſents to them in token of his favour. He could not give away Sicily, Corſica, nor Sardinia, becauſe they were not in his poſſeſſion; nor the duchy of Beneventum, of which he ſcarce enjoyed a titular ſuperiority: far leſs could he beſtow the republic of Venice, which did not even acknowledge him for emperor. The duke of Venice, at that period, acknowledged, as a meer matter of form, the emperor of the Eaſt, from whom he received the title of Hippatos. In the letters of pope Adrian, mention is made of the patrimonies of Spoleto and Beneventum; but theſe patrimonies muſt only be underſtood as the domains which the popes poſſeſſed in thoſe two duchies. Gregory VII. himſelf owns, that Charlemagne beſtowed a penſion of twelve hundred livres on the holy ſee. It is not at all probable that he ſhould have given ſuch trivial aſſiſtance to a ſee that was in poſſeſſion of ſo many fair provinces. The holy ſee did not poſſeſs Beneventum till long after this period, by the donation of the emperor Henry the Black, about the year 1047. This conceſſion was limited to the town, and did not extend to the whole duchy. But no mention was made of confirming the benefaction of Charlemagne.

The

The moſt probable conjecture we can form in the midſt of ſo many doubts is, that, in the reign of Charlemagne, the popes obtained the property of the marquiſate of Ancona *, over and above the cities, caſtles, and towns, which they poſſeſſed in other countries. This is the foundation on which I build my conjectures. When the emperor of the Weſt was renewed in the family of the Otho's, in the tenth century, Otho III. particularly aſſigned the marquiſate of Ancona to the holy ſee, confirming, at the ſame time, all the conceſſions which had been made to the church. It appears then that Charlemagne had actually given away this marquiſate; and that the troubles which enſued in Italy, had hindered the popes from enjoying his conceſſion. We ſhall ſee that in the ſequel they loſt the covenient dominion of this ſmall tract under the empire of the houſe of Suabia. We ſhall ſee them, like many other ſovereigns, ſometimes lords of extenſive territories, and ſometimes ſtripped of almoſt every diſtrict. Let us be ſatisfied with knowing, that at this day they poſſeſs an acknowledged ſovereignty, through a country that extends one hundred and eighty great Italian miles in length, from the gates of Mantua to the confines of the Abruzzo, along the Adriatic ſea; and that it ſpreads above one hundred miles in width, from Civita Vecchia to the ſhore of Ancona; that is, from the one ſea to the other. In order to ſecure ſuch a conſiderable dominion, it was neceſſary to be always in negociation, and often in arms.

While Charlemagne became emperor of the Weſt, the empire of the Eaſt was veſted in Irene †, that em-

* Ancona is a town in Italy, ſituated in the antient Pirenum, on the ſhore of the Adriatic; it is the ſeat of a biſhop, ſuffragan to the metropolitan of Fermo, and capital of the marquiſate, which extends between the Appenines and the gulph of Venice, four and twenty leagues in length, and about eighteen in breadth: it was erected into a marquiſate by the Lombard kings.

† Irene was the wife of Leo IV. Emperor of Conſtantinople. When he died, ſhe managed the reins of empire during the minority of her ſon Conſtantine VIII. with equal courage and addreſs. At length he deprived her of the adminiſtration, and plunged himſelf into all manner of debauchery. His mother took this opportunity to gratify

preſs, ſo famous for her courage and her crimes, who cauſed her only ſon to be put to death, after having deprived him of his eyes. She would have gladly effected the ruin of Charlemagne; but knowing herſelf too weak to contend with him in battle, ſhe reſolved to marry him, to unite the two empires. While this negociation was on the carpet, a revolution drove her from the throne which had coſt her ſo dear. Charles, therefore, was only maſter of the weſtern empire: he poſſeſſed ſcarce any thing in Spain; for we muſt not conſtrue into dominion the vain homage of a few Saracens: he had no ſway on the coaſt of Afric; but almoſt all the reſt of the continent of Europe was governed by this monarch. Had he made Rome his capital; had his ſucceſſors there fixed their principal reſidence; and eſpecially, if the cuſtom of dividing dominions among children had not prevailed in thoſe barbarous times, in all probability the world would have ſeen the Roman empire revive. Every thing in the ſequel concurred to diſmember that vaſt body which had been formed by the courage and fortune of Charlemagne; but nothing contributed ſo much as the abſurd conduct of his deſcendants.

He had no capital, though Aix-la-chapelle * was the place where he delighted chiefly to reſide: there he gave

gratify her ambition: ſhe raiſed an inſurrection, took him priſoner, ordered his eyes to be put out, and re-aſſumed the empire, which ſhe enjoyed about five years; at the expiration of which ſhe was dethroned by Nicephorus, and baniſhed to the iſle of Metelino, where, in a little time, ſhe died.

* Aix-la-chapelle was actually conſtituted capital of the weſtern empire by Charlemagne, who beautified and enlarged the city, and declared it the imperial ſeat; as appears by the following inſcriptions, which appeared over different gates of his palace.

Hic ſedes regni trans Alpes habeatur,
caput omnium civitatum, & provinciarum Galliæ.

Carolus inſignem reddens, hanc condidit urbem,
quam liberavit poſt Romam conſtituendo,
quot ſint trans Alpes, his ſemper regia ſedes,
ut caput urbs, hanc quoque colat & Gallia tota;
gaudet aquis granum præ cunctis munere clarum,
quæ prius imperii reges nunc laureat almi.

gave audience with the moſt dazzling pomp and magnificence, to the ambaſſadors of the caliphs, and to thoſe of Conſtantinople. Beſides, he was always either in the field or on a journey, in the ſame manner as Charles V. lived ſo many ages after this period. He divided his dominions, even in his own life-time, according to the cuſtom that prevailed among all the monarchs of thoſe times: but, at length, when of all the ſons whom he deſigned for crowns, none remained but that Lewis ſo well known by the epithet of Debonair, on whom he had already beſtowed the kingdom of Aquitain *, he aſſociated this prince in the empire, at Aix-la-chapelle, and commanded him to take, with his own hands, the imperial crown from the altar, to let the world ſee that the crown was due alone to the valour of the father, and the merit of the ſon: and as if he had foreſeen that one day the miniſters of the altar would arrogate to themſelves the right of diſpoſing of that diadem.

He was in the right to declare his ſon emperor in his own life-time; for this dignity, acquired by his own good fortune, was not ſecured to his ſon by the right of inheritance: but in leaving the empire to Lewis, and giving Italy to Bernard, the ſon of his ſon Pepin, did not he himſelf tear in pieces that empire which he wanted to preſerve for his poſterity? was not this, in effect, arming his ſucceſſors againſt each other? had he any reaſon to preſume that the nephew, who was king of Italy, would obey his uncle, who was emperor? or that the emperor would not endeavour to make himſelf

* Aquitain, according to Cæſar, was a third part of antient Gaul: and much learning has been exhibited in attempts to aſcertain the boundaries of this country. Certain it is, it conſiſted of three provinces, comprehending the cities of Bourges, Auvergne, Cahors, Limoges, Bourdeaux, Angouleme, Xaintes, Poitiers, Cominges, Bearn, Aire, &c. It was formerly called Armorica, from the Gauliſh word Armor, ſignifying a ſea-coaſt. Yet this appellation was afterwards confined to Bretagne. Charlemagne, at his return from Spain in the year 778, erected Aquitain into a kingdom, adding to it Gaſcony, Languedoc, Biſcay, the marquiſate of Spain, and the county of Barcelona; and beſtowed it upon his youngeſt ſon Lewis the Debonair.

maſter in Italy? Be that as it will, Charlemagne died in the year 814, with the reputation of having been an emperor as fortunate as Auguſtus, and as warlike as Adrian; but not ſo good as Trajan or Antonius, to whom no ſovereign was ever comparable.

At that time, there was a prince in the Eaſt, who equalled Charlemagne in glory as well as in power: this was the celebrated caliph, Aaron Rachild *, who greatly ſurpaſſed him in juſtice, ſcience, and humanity. I could almoſt venture to add pope Adrian to theſe two illuſtrious men; a pontiff who, though in a leſs elevated rank, and nearly in a private ſtation, with virtues perhaps not ſo heroic, yet diſplayed conſummate prudence, to which his ſucceſſors have owed all their power and grandeur.

The curioſity of mankind, which penetrates even into the privacy of princes, would gladly ſee a circumſtantial detail of Charlemagne's private tranſactions, and even pry into his amours. He is ſaid to have indulged his love of women to ſuch exceſs, that he deflowered his own daughters. The ſame calumny has been recorded of Auguſtus; but of what conſequence to mankind is the detail of theſe weakneſſes, which never had the leaſt influence on public affairs?

I conſider his reign in a point of view more worthy of a patriot's attention. The countries that now compoſe France and Germany, as far as the Rhine, enjoyed uninterrupted peace for near fifty years; and Italy for the ſpace of thirteen, after his elevation to the empire. There was no revolution in France; no calamity during this half century, which in that light ſtands diſtinguiſhed from all others; yet even this long tract of happineſs and repoſe was not ſufficient to reſtore politeneſs and

* This renowned Arabian was the fifth caliph of the houſe of the Abaſides: he greatly extended his empire by conqueſt; his reign was an uninterrupted ſeries of proſperity: he was mild, generous, and beneficent, and a great encourager of learning and the liberal arts: he maintained a friendly correſpondence with Charlemagne, to whom he made rich preſents, and among the reſt, a clock of very curious workmanſhip.

and the liberal arts. The ruſt of barbariſm was too ſtrong, and continued to increaſe in the ſucceeding ages.

CHAP. X.

MANNERS and CUSTOMS that prevailed about the Time of CHARLEMAGNE.

I SHALL ſtop at this celebrated æra, to conſider the cuſtoms, laws, religion, and manners, which then prevailed. The Franks had been always barbarians, and ſo continued to be after the death of Charlemagne: his reign alone had a gleam of politeneſs, which was probably the fruit of his journey to Rome, or rather the effect of his own genius. His predeceſſors were illuſtrious for nothing but their depredations: they deſtroyed cities, but they founded none. The Gauls had found their account in being conquered by the Romans. Marſeilles, Arles, Autun, Lyons, and Triers, were flouriſhing cities, that peaceably enjoyed their municipal laws, ſubordinate to the ſage regulations of the Romans; and they were animated by a very extenſive commerce. We find, in a letter from a proconſul to Theodoſius, that the city of Autun contained five and twenty thouſand families: but, ſoon as the Burgundians, the Goths, and the Franks, arrived in Gaul, the large cities were depopulated; the circus's and amphitheatres built by the Romans, even to the banks of the Rhine, were either demoliſhed, or allowed to fall in ruins. The criminal and unfortunate queen Brunehaud * preſerved ſome

* Brunehaud, or Brunichilde, was daughter of Athanagildas, king of the Viſigoths in Spain. She married Sigebert I. king of Auſtraſia, in the year 568, and was mother of Childebert II. She is repreſented as a monſter of luſt, avarice, cruelty, and revenge. During the minority of her ſon, ſhe acted as regent, and rendered herſelf ſo odious to the people, that they ſtripped her naked, and drove her out of the kingdom. In this condition ſhe was found by a peaſant called Diſier, who cloathed and conducted her to Chalon ſur Saone, which was governed by her grandſon Thierri; and this guide

ſome leagues of thoſe cauſeways which we have never been able to imitate; this is a circumſtance which we ſtill remember with ſurprize.

What hindered thoſe new-comers to build regular edifices on the Roman models? They had ſtone, marble, and better wood than we now can find. The flocks of England and Spain were covered with fine wool, as they are at this day; yet broad-cloath was manufactured no where but in Italy. Why did not the reſt of Europe import the merchandize of Aſia? Why were all the conveniencies that ſweeten the bitterneſs of life, at that time unknown? For no other reaſon but becauſe the Barbarians who paſſed the Rhine, infected other nations with their ſavage manners. We may judge by thoſe Salique, Ripuary *, and Burgundian laws, which Charlemagne himſelf could not abrogate, and therefore confirmed. Poverty and rapaciouſneſs had ſet a pecuniary value upon a man's life, mutilation, rape, inceſt, and poiſoning. He that could afford to pay four hundred ſols, that is, four hundred crowns, might ſlay a biſhop with impunity. The murder of a prieſt was rated at two hundred ſols; the ſame price was ſet upon rape, and poiſoning with herbs. A ſorcereſs

guide was recompenſed with the biſhopric of Auxerre. After ſhe had grown old in wickedneſs, Clotharius II. charged her with all the crimes ſhe had committed; and among others, with having cauſed the death of ten kings. Being found guilty, and condemned, ſhe was racked three days ſucceſſively; then carried through the camp in proceſſion mounted on a camel; afterwards dragged over the ſtones at the tail of a wild horſe; and when dead, her body was committed to the flames.

* The Ripuarii were a colony of the Franks, that ſettled on the borders of the Rhine, the Moſelle, and the Roer, whence they acquired their name Ripuarii, of *ripa* a bank. They had their own peculiar laws, which were compiled and corrected by Dagobert, and are ſtill extant in the *Codex veterum legum, edit. Lindinbrog.* They are very minute, and extremely well calculated for the preſervation of the public peace. Whoever ſtripped a man that was aſleep, or dead, was condemned in a fine of two hundred ſols of gold. If a man met a ſtrayed horſe, he durſt not mount him, on pain of paying fifteen ſols of gold. The ſame penalty was decreed againſt a man who ſhould take a woman by the hand; double the ſum was exacted if he took her by the arm; and he paid five and forty ſols of gold if he

ceres who had fed on human flesh, was quit for two hundred sols; a circumstance which proves, that the witches of those days were not only found among the dregs of the people, as in the latter ages, but that those horrible extravagancies were likewise practised among persons of wealth. Single combat and the ordeals, decided, as we shall see, all disputes about inheritance, and the validity of wills: their whole jurisprudence was dictated by ferocity and superstition. Let us judge of the manners of the people by those of their princes. We find them distinguished by no act of magnanimity. The Christian religion, which ought to have humanized mankind, did not hinder Clovis from causing the petty sovereigns his neighbours to be assassinated*. The two children of Clodomir were massacred at Paris, in the year 533, by their uncles Childebert and Clotharius, who are distinguished by the title of kings of France: Clodoaldo†, the brother of these murdered innocents, is invoked under the name of St. Cloud, because he was obliged to become a Monk.

In the reign of Chilperic, king of Soissons, in the year 562, the subjects who were slaves abandoned this pretended kingdom, wearied by the tyranny of their master,

he was convicted of having touched her bosom. Death was never inflicted but upon those who had conspired against the life of their prince. The fine for murdering a bishop amounted to nine hundred sols; six hundred for a priest, and two hundred for a layman. When the murderer could not pay the fine, it was exacted of his kindred; and if they were not able, he became the slave of those to whom the fine was due.

* Such was the fate of Sigebert, king of Cologne, Ragnacarus, king of Cambray, and his brother Richarius, Cararic, sovereign of another district, and his children, who fell victims to the cruelty of this barbarian.

† Clodoald, or St. Cloud, was son of Clodomir, king of Orleans, and grandson of Clovis and St. Clothilda. When his brothers were murdered by their uncles, he escaped through the affection of some noblemen, who conveyed him to a secret place where he was educated. When he arrived at man's estate, he renounced the kingdom and the world. He was ordained priest by the bishop Eusebius, and founded a monastery in the neighbourhood of Paris, at the village of Nogent; which from him is now called St. Cloud.—There his tomb is still to be seen, inscribed with a very antient epitaph.

maſter, who took all their bread and wine, as he could not take money, of which they were quite deſtitute. One Sigebert, and another Chilperic were aſſaſſinated. Brunehaud, who from an Arian became a Catholic, was accuſed of a thouſand murders: Clotharius II. no leſs barbarous than ſhe, ordered her to be dragged through his camp at a horſe's tail; and ſhe periſhed by this new kind of puniſhment in the year 616. All the monuments that remain of thoſe hideous times, are foundations of monaſteries, and a confuſed remembrance of miſery and rapine.

We are not to ſuppoſe that the emperors acknowledged for kings thoſe barbarous chiefs who ruled in Burgundy, at Soiſſons, Paris, Metz, and Orleans: they never beſtowed upon them the title of *Baſileus*. They did not even confer it upon Dagobert II. who united under his dominion the whole weſtern and eaſtern France, as far as the Weſer. Hiſtorians expatiate upon the magnificence of Dagobert, and, as a proof of it, mention the goldſmith of St. Elay; who, they ſay, came to court with a girdle adorned with precious ſtones; that is, he ſold diamonds, and carried them in his girdle. They ſpeak of the magnificent edifices built by this monarch. Where are they to be found? The old church of St. Paul is no other than an inconſiderable Gothic monument. This we know of Dagobert; that he had three wives at the ſame time; that he aſſembled councils; and tyrannized over his ſubjects.

In his reign, a merchant of Sens, called Samon, went to trade in Germany, from whence he proceeded to the country of the Slaves*. Theſe ſavages were ſo aſtoniſhed

* The Slaves, or Sclaves, were a people of Germany originally ſettled between the Elbe and the Viſtula; but, about the end of the ſixth century, they penetrated further, and took poſſeſſion of what is now called Bohemia, and the adjoining provinces. They likewiſe made an irruption into Illyria, which they pillaged for ſome time; however, they were obliged to abandon it with precipitation, before the troops of Bajan Cagan, prince of the Abares, in the year 578. They are deſcribed by Procopius, as a ſavage people, living under a ſort of democratical government, in great ignorance, want, and ſimplicity: yet they poſſeſſed a warlike genius, and obtained

aſtoniſhed to ſee a man who had travelled ſo far, to ſupply them with thoſe things which they wanted, that they inveſted him with the ſovereignty†. This very Samon is ſaid to have made war upon Dagobert; and if the king of the Franks had three wives, the new Slavonian monarch had fifteen. It was under this Dagobert, that the authority of the mayors of the palace commenced. After him came a race of ſlothful princes; then confuſion and the deſpotiſm of the mayors enſued. It was in the time of thoſe mayors, at the beginning of the eighth century, that the Arabians, who had ſubdued Spain, penetrated to Toulouſe, made themſelves maſters of Guienne, ravaged the country as far as the Loire, and had well nigh conquered all Gaul from the Franks who had wreſted it from the Romans. One may judge in what condition the people, the church, and the laws muſt have been at this juncture.

CHAP. XI.

LAWS and CUSTOMS that prevailed in the Reign of CHARLEMAGNE.

CHARLES MARTEL, the uſurper and ſupport of the ſovereign power in a great monarchy, who vanquiſhed

tained ſeveral victories over the Roman armies. One of their colonies ſettled in the country between the Saave, the Draave, and the Danube, which ſtill retains the name of Sclavonia; though under this appellation, Boſnia, Dalmatia, and Croatia, were formerly comprehended.

† Samon was not of Sens, but of the country of Senegau in Brabant; nor was he elected king of the Sclaves, until he had approved himſelf worthy of the throne, by his valour and conduct; in conſequence of which they obtained ſeveral victories over the Venedes, and freed themſelves from the yoke of Abares, king of that people. Some merchants of Auſtraſia having been robbed in the country of the Sclaves, Dagobert ſent an envoy to Samon, to demand ſatisfaction. When Samon propoſed an alliance with the Auſtraſians, this ambaſſador told him, "That Chriſtians could not poſſibly engage in any alliance with dogs." "If we are dogs, (replied Samon) we muſt be allowed to bite whenever we find ourſelves ill uſed." The envoy was diſmiſſed with contempt. A war enſued, and the Auſtraſians were defeated by Samon.

vanquiſhed the conquering Arabs, and repulſed them to Gaſcony, received, however, no other title from pope Gregory II. than that of *Sousroitilet*, or *Subregulus*, when he implored his protection againſt the king of Lombardy. He made diſpoſitions for marching to the relief of the Roman church; but, in the mean time, he pillaged the churches of the Franks, beſtowed the riches of the convents upon his captains, and detained his own ſovereign in captivity. We have ſeen the tranſactions of his ſon Pepin, and of his grandſon Charlemagne.

The great conqueſts of this laſt monarch were owing to his conſtant care of having veteran troops in his ſervice. Theſe were levied by the dukes that governed the provinces, in the ſame manner as the ſoldiers in Turkey are now raiſed by the beglerbegs: thoſe dukes had been inſtituted in Italy by Diocleſian. The counts, who ſeem to have derived their origin from the time of Theodoſius, were next in command to the dukes, and aſſembled troops, each in his own diſtrict. The farms, burroughs, and villages, furniſhed a certain number of ſoldiers, proportioned to their ability. Twelve farms found one horſeman, armed with helmet and cuiraſs: the other ſoldiers had neither; but only a long ſquare buckler, a battle-ax, a javelin, and a ſword. Every archer was obliged to have at leaſt twelve arrows in his quiver. The province that furniſhed the ſoldiery, ſupplied them likewiſe with corn and neceſſary proviſion for ſix months: the king maintained them for the reſt of the campaign. The general rendezvous was on the firſt day of March, or in the beginning of May; and at theſe times the parliaments were uſually held. The battering ram, the baliſta, the tortoiſe, and moſt of the Roman machines were employed in ſieges. The noblemen diſtinguiſhed by the appellations of Barons, Leudes, and Richeomes, with their followers, compoſed the ſmall number of cavalry, which, at that time, appeared in their armies: the Muſſulmans of Africa and Spain were much better provided with horſe. Charles had a naval force, that is, large boats at the mouths of all the great rivers of his empire. Before his time, ſuch veſſels were not known among the Barbarians; and even a long time after

after his death they were ignorant of their utility. By this precaution, and his military police, he put a ſtop to the inundation of people from the North, and confined them within their own frozen climates; but, under his weak deſcendants, they deluged all Europe.

Public affairs were regulated in aſſemblies that repreſented the whole nation: in his reign, however, the parliaments had no will but that of a maſter, who could command as well as perſuade. Commerce flouriſhed becauſe he was maſter of the ſea: the merchants ſettled on the coaſt of Tuſcany, as well as thoſe of Marſeilles, traded to Conſtantinople among the Chriſtians, and to the port of Alexandria with the Muſſulmans, by whom they were well received, and ſupplied with the riches of Aſia.

Venice and Genoa, which were afterwards ſo powerful by their traffic, had not yet engroſſed the wealth of nations: though Venice began to be rich and important, divers manufactures of ſtuffs and woollen cloth were carried on at Rome, Ravenna, Milan, Lyons, Arles, and Tours. Steel was tempered there, in imitation of that made at Damaſcus. They likewiſe knew the art of making glaſs; but ſilk ſtuffs were not wove in any town of the weſtern empire.

The Venetians began to import them from Conſtantinople; but it was not till four hundred years after Charlemagne, that the Norman princes eſtabliſhed a ſilk manufacture at Palermo. Linen was then very uncommon. St. Boniface, in a letter to a German biſhop, deſires he will ſend him ſome frize for his feet-waſhing. In all probability, this want of linen was the cauſe of thoſe cutaneous diſtempers, known by the name of leproſy, ſo rife at this period; for the hoſpitals called lazar-houſes were already very numerous *.

The coin bore nearly the ſame value with that of the Roman empire ſince the reign of Conſtantine. The golden

* The leproſy was hardly known in the northern parts of Europe, until it was imported from Africa and Aſia in the time of the Cruſades: and it would be no difficult taſk to prove, that linen is much more productive than woollen ſtuff, of cutaneous, and all other diſtempers.

golden ſol was the Solidus Romanus, equivalent to forty deniers of ſilver; and theſe deniers, though they were ſometimes heavier, ſometimes lighter, weighed, upon an average, thirty grains, one with another *.

The golden ſol would now, in 1740, be worth about fifteen francs, and the ſilver denier be equivalent to thirty ſols, according to the preſent way of reckoning.

In reading theſe hiſtories, we muſt always remember, that beſides theſe real pieces of gold and ſilver coin, people in their calculations made uſe of another denomination. They often reckoned by fictitious ſpecies, which was no more than a method of counting, ſuch as is practiſed at this day. The Aſiatics and the Greeks reckoned by minæ and talents, and the Romans by great ſeſterces, though there was no ſuch coin as a great ſeſtertium, or a talent †.

The numerary pound, in the time of Charlemagne, was computed equivalent in weight to twelve ounces of ſilver. This pound was numerically divided, as at this day, into twenty parts: there were indeed ſilver ſols, like our crowns, weighing each, the twentieth, the two and twentieth, or the four and twentieth part of a pound of twelve ounces; and this ſol was, like ours, divided into twelve deniers. But Charlemagne having ordained that the ſilver ſol ſhould be preciſely the twentieth part of twelve ounces, people in their accompts, began to conſider twenty ſols as a pound. For two centuries the coin remained in the ſame condition to which it was reduced by Charlemagne; but, by little and

* The Roman *Solidus* was a golden coin, in value about an Engliſh noble, or ſix ſhillings and eight pence. The denarius, a ſilver coin, worth about eight pence halfpenny.

† It is a doubt with the learned, whether there ever were two ſorts of *Seſterces*. Agricola is of opinion there was only one kind, and that was a coin in value the fourth part of a denarius, or two aſſes and an half, being two pounds and an half of braſs coin. Budæus, indeed, diſtinguiſhed two ſorts of ſeſterces; the little, or ordinary ſeſtertius, and the great ſeſtertium, an imaginary and numerical ſpecies, equivalent to one thouſand little ſeſterces. But there is no good argument offered to ſupport this diſtinction.

Mina, from the Greek μνᾶα, a pound, equal, to one hundred drachmas, or three pounds ſterling. Sixty of theſe minæ compoſed an Attic talent, which muſt therefore have been worth 180l.

and little, different kings, in times of neceſſity, ſometimes mixed the ſols with an alloy, and ſometimes diminiſhed their weight; ſo that, by an alteration which reflects diſgrace upon almoſt all the governments in Europe, that ſol, which was heretofore nearly the ſame as our preſent crown, is now no more than a light piece of copper, with the mixture of one eleventh at moſt of ſilver; and the livre, which was formerly the ſign repreſentative of twelve ounces of ſilver, is now no more in France than the ſign repreſentative of twenty copper ſols. The denier, which was the hundredth and twenty-fourth part of a pound of ſilver, is no more than one third of that baſe coin which we call a liard. Suppoſe then, that one town in France owed to another one hundred and twenty livres of rent, that is, fourteen hundred and forty ounces of ſilver, as eſtimated in the time of Charlemagne, it would now diſcharge the debt by the payment of what we call a crown of ſix francs. The numerical pound of the Engliſh and the Dutch has undergone leſs alteration; a pound ſterling of England is worth about two and twenty francs of France; and a Dutch pound is nearly equal to twelve: thus the Hollanders have deviated leſs than the French from the original inſtitution, and the Engliſh leaſt of all.

As often, therefore, as hiſtory mentions money under the denomination of pounds, we have nothing to do but examine the value of that pound at the time, and in the country ſo ſpecified, and compare it with our preſent money diſtinguiſhed by the ſame appellation. We ought to have the ſame attention in reading the Greek and Roman hiſtory: for example, it is a very troubleſome taſk for a reader to be obliged every moment to reform the calculations made in the antient hiſtory of a celebrated profeſſor in the univerſity of Paris, in the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of Fleuri, and in almoſt all uſeful authors. When they would expreſs the value of talents, minæ, and ſeſterces, in French money, they always compute by the eſtimate which was made by ſome learned men before the death of the great Colbert. But the mark of eight ounces, which under that miniſter was valued at ſix and twenty francs and ten ſols, has been for a long

a long time worth nine and forty livres and ten ſols; a difference which amounts to near one half. This difference, which at ſome particular times has been much greater, may be either increaſed or diminiſhed. We ought to remember this variation, without which we muſt have very erroneous ideas of the ſtrength of antient ſtates, their commerce, the pay of their ſoldiers, and, in a word, of their whole œconomy. It appears that the quantity of ſpecies which then circulated in Italy, and about the banks of the Rhine, was eight times leſs than it is in the preſent age: we cannot judge of this circumſtance better than by the price of neceſſaries; and I find theſe were eight times cheaper in the reign of Charlemagne than in our days. Four and twenty pounds of white bread were, by the capitularies, valued at one denier of ſilver; this denier was the fortieth part of a golden ſol, which was worth from between fifteen to ſixteen livres of our preſent money; thus the pound of bread came to a liard and ſomething more, that is in effect an eighth part of the price now uſually given.

In the northern countries ſilver was ſtill more ſcarce: there, for example, the price of an ox was fixed at a golden ſol. We ſhall ſee in the ſequel, in what manner trade and riches extended themſelves cloſe in the rear of each other.

The liberal arts and ſciences muſt have had but very weak beginnings in thoſe vaſt countries that were ſtill in a ſtate of barbarity. Eghinhart, ſecretary to Charlemagne, gives us to underſtand that this conqueror could not ſign his own name; nevertheleſs, by the force of his natural genius, he comprehended how neceſſary it would be to encourage literature: he brought teachers of grammar and arithmetic from Rome: the ruins of that capital furniſhed every thing to the Weſt, which is not yet ſufficiently reformed. Alcuin *, that Engliſh monk, ſo famous

* Alcuin, otherwiſe called Flaccus Albinus, was profeſſor of theology at York from whence he was invited by Charlemagne in the year 794, to the council of Frankfort to combat the errors of Felix and Elipandus. He reſided at Aix-la Chapelle, at the requeſt of Charlemagne, with whom he was a great favourite; and gave public

famous in thoſe days, and Peter of Piſa, who taught Charlemagne the rudiments of grammar, had both ſtudied at Rome.

There were chanters in the churches of France; and what is very remarkable, they were known by the name of Gauliſh chanters. The race of the conquering Francs had cultivated no art or ſcience: thoſe Gauls pretended, as at this day, to diſpute the prize for vocal muſic with the Romans. The Gregorian muſic, attributed to St. Gregory the Great, was not without merit; there is ſome dignity even in its ſimplicity. The Gauliſh ſingers, who did not uſe the antient alphabetical notes, had corrupted the muſic which they pretended to embelliſh; and Charlemagne, in one of his expeditions to Italy, obliged them to conform to the muſic of their maſters. Pope Adrian ſupplied them with books, in which the muſic was noted: and two Italian muſicians were eſtabliſhed to teach theſe notes, one at Metz, and the other at Soiſſons. They were beſides obliged to ſend organs from Rome. There was not a ſtriking clock in any town of his whole empire, nor indeed was there any till about the thirteenth century; hence the antient cuſtom, ſtill preſerved in Germany, Flanders, and England, of employing watchmen to call the hours in the night. The preſent of a ſtriking clock, which the caliph Aaron al Rachid ſent to Charlemagne, was looked upon as a miracle. With reſpect to the ſciences of the underſtanding, philoſophy, phyſics, aſtronomy, and the principles of medicine, how was it poſſible that they ſhould be known? They had but juſt dawned in this part of the world.

They reckoned by nights; and hence in England they ſtill ſay a fortnight, in order to expreſs two weeks. The language called * Romanic, began to be formed by

public lectures in his palace. He acquired ſuch reputation for learning, that he was uſually ſtiled the Univerſaliſt, and Secretary of the Liberal Arts. In his lattter days he retired to the abbey of St. Martin, at Tours, where he died in the year 804. His epitaph written by himſelf, in the meaſure of the *carmen elegiacum*, may be ſeen with his different works in the collection of Du Chêne.

* This language was called Romance, and as the firſt novels of chivalry were written in it, they derived the name of Romances.

by a mixture of Latin with the Teutonic: this is the origin of the French, Spaniſh, and Italian languages. It continued till the reign of Frederic II. and it is ſtill ſpoken in ſome villages of the Griſons, and towards Swiſſerland. The garments, which have been always varying ſince the ruin of the Roman empire, were very ſhort, except on days of ceremony, when the coat was covered with a cloak, frequently lined with fur. Theſe ſkins were brought, as they are now, from the North, eſpecially from Ruſſia: from the knee downwards they ſtill preſerved the Roman manner of dreſſing. It is obſerved, that Charlemagne's legs were covered with fillets of various colours, in the form of buſkins, as they are ſtill worn by the Highlanders * of Scotland, the only people upon earth among whom the military garb of the Romans is preſerved.

CHAP. XII.

Of the PREVAILING RELIGION in the Age of CHARLEMAGNE.

IF we now turn our eyes upon the happy conſequences of religion; upon the evils which mankind brought upon themſelves when they uſed it as an inſtrument of their paſſions, upon the conſecrated rites, and the abuſe of thoſe rites; the quarrel between the Iconoclaſtes and the Iconolatres †, is the moſt important object that firſt preſents itſelf to our view.

The empreſs Irene, guardian of her unfortunate ſon Conſtantine Porphirogeneta, in order to pave her way to the empire, flattered the people and the monks who had ſtill a hankering after Image-worſhip, although it had been proſcribed by ſo many emperors ſince the reign

* Our author is miſtaken with reſpect to the Highlanders: they do not wear diſtinct fillets or bandages, but hoſe of a ſtriped ſtuff of divers colours, which they call *tartan*.

† The Image-breakers and the Image-worſhippers.

reign of Leo the Iſaurian. She was attached to it herſelf, becauſe it had been abhorred by her huſband. Irene had been perſuaded, that, in order to gain the aſcendancy over her huſband, ſhe muſt place the images of certain ſaints under his bolſter. Credulity finds way even into the moſt politic boſoms. The emperor, her huſband, had puniſhed the author of this ſuperſtition. Irene, after his death, gave free ſcope to her own fancy and ambition: this was the cauſe of her aſſembling, in the year 786, the ſecond council of Nice, the ſeventh œcumenical council, which firſt began at Conſtantinople: ſhe cauſed Taraiſus, her ſecretary of ſtate, a layman, to be erected patriarch. There had been formerly ſome examples of laymen thus raiſed to biſhoprics, without paſſing through the other degrees; but, at that time, this cuſtom no longer ſubſiſted.

When this patriarch opened the council, the conduct of pope Adrian appeared very extraordinary. He did not anathematize the ſecretary of ſtate who had erected himſelf into a patriarch: he did no more than modeſtly proteſt, in his letter to Irene, againſt the title of Univerſal Patriarch; but he inſiſted upon her reſtoring to the Holy See the patrimonies of Sicily: he loudly demanded reſtitution of this petty eſtate; while, in imitation of his predeceſſors, he wreſted the profitable dominion of ſo many fair territories, which, he aſſured us, were beſtowed by Pepin and Charlemagne. In the mean time the œcumenical council of Nice, at which the pope's legates and this miniſterial patriarch preſided, thought proper to re-eſtabliſh the worſhip of images.

It is a circumſtance confeſſed by all judicious writers, that the fathers of this council, the number of whom amounted to three hundred and fifty, recognized a number of pieces that were evidently ſpurious; a number of miracles, the bare recital of which would, in our days, be deemed ſcandalous; a number of books that were apocryphal. Yet theſe falſe pieces ought not to affect the credit of the genuine works, on the merits of which they decided. But, when it became neceſſary that this council ſhould be received by Charlemagne and the churches of France, how was the pope embarraſſed? Charles had loudly declared againſt images; he had

had given directions for writing the books called Carolins, in which that worſhip was anathematized. In the year 794, he aſſembled a council at Frankfort, at which he preſided, according to the cuſtom of all the emperors; a council compoſed of three hundred biſhops or abbots, as well of Italy as of France, who unanimouſly rejected the ſervice and adoration of images. This equivocal word Adoration was the ſource of all thoſe differences. If mankind would define the words they uſe, there would be fewer diſputes: more than one kingdom have been overthrown through a miſunderſtanding.

While pope Adrian ſent into France the acts of the ſecond council of Nice, he received the Carolin books, in oppoſition to that council; and he was preſſed in the name of Charles, to declare the emperor of Conſtantinople and his mother heretics. We ſee by this conduct of Charles, that he wanted to derive from the pretended hereſy of the emperor, a new right or pretence to wreſt Rome from him under colour of juſtice.

The pope, divided between the council of Nice which he adopted, and Charlemagne whom he had no inclination to diſoblige, choſe, in my opinion, a politic medium, which ought to have ſerved as an example in all the unfortunate diſputes which generally divided Chriſtendom. He explained the Carolin books in a manner that was favourable to the council of Nice, and by this expedient refuted the king, without incurring his diſpleaſure: he diſpenſed with the worſhip of images; a relaxation which was very reaſonable among the Germans, hardly reſcued from their idolatry, and the ignorant Franks who had very little ſculpture or painting: at the ſame time he exhorted the people to abſtain from breaking thoſe images. Thus he ſatisfied both parties, and left it to time to confirm or aboliſh a rite that was ſtill doubtful. Attentive to the art of managing mankind, and making religion ſubſervient to his own intereſt, he wrote to Charlemagne in theſe terms: "I cannot declare Irene and her ſon heretics, after the council of Nice: but I will brand them as ſuch, if they do not reſtore the lands of Sicily."

We

We ſee the ſame diſcretion of this pope in a diſpute that was ſtill more delicate, which alone would have been ſufficient at any other time to kindle up the flame of civil war. The queſtion was, Whether the Holy Ghoſt proceeded from the Father and the Son, or from the Father only! At firſt in the Eaſt, the firſt council of Nice had added, that he proceeded from the Father; afterwards in Spain, and then in France and Germany, they added that he proceeded from the Father and the Son. This article was believed by almoſt the whole empire of Charles.

Theſe words of the creed, *Qui ex patre filioque procedit*, were deemed ſacred among the Franks, even though they had never been adopted at Rome. Charlemagne preſſed the pope to declare himſelf on this article; the pope replied, that he did not condemn the king's opinion: nevertheleſs he made no change in the creed at Rome: he appeaſed the diſpute by forbearing to decide it. In a word, he treated ſpiritual affairs as a prince, whereas too many princes have treated them as biſhops.

From that period, the profound policy of the popes eſtabliſhed their power by little and little. A collection was made of falſe facts, now known under the name of Falſe Decretals; they are ſaid to have been digeſted by a Spaniard called Iſidore Mercator, or Piſcator, or Peccator. They were circulated and put in force by the German biſhops, whoſe integrity had been impoſed upon. Some pretend that there are now inconteſtible proofs of their having been compoſed by one Algeram, abbot of Senones, aud biſhop of Metz. They are ſtill extant in manuſcript, in the library of the Vatican; but what ſignifies their authenticity. Theſe falſe decretals are ſuppoſed to contain antient canons, decreeing, that even a provincial council ſhall not be held without the pope's permiſſion; and that his holineſs ſhould be the laſt reſort in all eccleſiaſtical cauſes. In theſe decretals the immediate ſucceſſors of the apoſtles are made to ſpeak; nay, they are ſuppoſed to be the writers of the collection: true it is, the whole being in the barbarous ſtile of the eighth century, abounding with

errors in hiſtory and geography, the artifice was very groſs; but the people were groſly ignorant on whom they impoſed. Mankind were puzzled by theſe falſe decretals for eight whole centuries; and at laſt, when the falſhood ſtood confeſt, the rites and cuſtoms which they eſtabliſhed ſtill ſubſiſted in one part of the church; antiquity maintained the place of truth *.

Even at that time, the biſhops of the Weſt were temporal lords, and poſſeſſed many lands in fief; but none of them were independent ſovereigns. The kings of France nominated perſons to biſhoprics; in this particular more reſolute and politic than the Greek emperors and the kings of Lombardy, who contented themſelves with interpoſing their authority in the elections.

The firſt chriſtian churches were governed as republics, upon the model of the ſynagogues. Thoſe who reſided at theſe aſſemblies inſenſibly aſſumed the title *Epiſcopus*, a Greek word, uſed by the Greeks as an appellation to their governors of colonies. The elders of theſe aſſemblies were called Preſbyters, which, in the Greek language, ſignifies old men.

Charlemagne in his old age inveſted the biſhops with a right to which his own ſon fell a victim; they made this prince believe, that in the code digeſted in the reign of Theodoſius, there was a law importing, that if two laymen carried on a proceſs againſt each other, and one of them ſhould refer the diſpute to the arbitration of a biſhop,

* Thoſe decretals were compoſed of paſſages taken from councils held about the latter end of the ſeventh century, as well as of letters written by the fathers of the church. Among many other marks of forgery, authors mention the uniformity of the barbarous ſtile, which is the ſame through the whole, though the letters are ſaid to be written by ſo many different hands. St. Clement, in his pretended letter to St. James, biſhop of Jeruſalem, mentions the death of St. Peter; whereas it is well known, that St. James died before St. Peter. He mentions arch-prieſts, arch-deacons, primates, &c. at a time when ſuch titles were not known. He addreſſes one of his letters to all Chriſtian princes, before any prince had embraced the Chriſtian faith. In writing to St. James, he quotes, in the name of St. Peter, a paſſage from that apoſtle's own epiſtle; and finally, he mentions his having been preſent at the death of Ananias, which happened before Clement was converted.

biſhop, the other was obliged to ſubmit to his deciſion, without power of appeal. This law, which had never been put in execution, is deemed by all the critics to be ſuppoſititious: it is the laſt of the Theodoſian code, without date, and without the names of the conſuls. It excited a kind of private civil war between the tribunals of juſtice and the miniſters of the ſanctuary; but as at that time all in the Weſt, except the clergy, were in profound ignorance, it is matter of ſurprize that it did not give ſtill a greater power to thoſe, who, having all the little learning to themſelves, ſeemed alone deſerving of the prerogative to judge mankind.

In the ſame manner as the biſhops diſputed this authority with the laity, the monks began to diſpute it with the biſhops, although theſe were their maſters by the canons: the monks were already too rich to be ſubmiſſive. This celebrated formula of Marculſus was already often put in practice: "I, for the repoſe of my ſoul, and that I may not after my death be placed among the goats, give and bequeath to ſuch a monaſtery, &c." Even in the firſt age of the church people believed the world was near an end: and this opinion gaining ground from one century to another, they beſtowed their lands upon the monks, as if they were to be preſerved in the general conflagration. Many charters of donation began with theſe words, *Adventante mundi veſpero* *. A long time before Charlemagne, there were Benedictine abbots powerful enough to raiſe rebellions. An abbot of Fontenelle had the boldneſs to aſſemble troops, and put himſelf at the head of a party againſt Charles Martel. The hero cauſed the monk to be beheaded; an execution which contributed not a little to all thoſe revelations which ſo many monks had in the ſequel, concerning the damnation of Charles Martel. Before that time we find an abbot of St. Remy, of Rheims, together with the biſhop of that city, exciting a civil war

* This is bad Latin, if it was meant to ſignify the evening, which is *veſper*, *veſperis*; and in the ablative caſe, *veſpere*, or *veſperi*: and bad ſenſe if it was applied to the evening ſtar; inaſmuch as the *veſperus mundi* can ſignify nothing but the planet *Venus*, which may be ſaid to come every night.

againſt Childebert, in the ſixth century; a crime which belongs to none but men of power and influence.

The biſhops and abbots had a great number of ſlaves; the abbot Alcuin is reproached with having had no fewer than twenty thouſand: nor is this number incredible; Alcuin poſſeſſed three abbeys, the lands of which might have been inhabited by twenty thouſand perſons. Theſe ſlaves, known by the name of Serfs, could neither marry, nor change their habitation without the permiſſion of the abbot. They were obliged to drive their carts fifty leagues, when he commanded this ſervice. They worked for him three days in the week, and he ſhared all the fruits of their labour. Thoſe Benedictines indeed could not be charged with having by their wealth violated their vow of poverty, for no ſuch vow they made. They took no other engagement at their admiſſion into the order, than that of being obedient to the abbot: they even frequently received grants of uncultivated grounds, which they grubbed with their own hands, and afterwards portioned out to the ſerfs, to be cultivated. They raiſed villages, and even little towns, around the monaſteries. There they ſtudied; and they alone were the means of preſerving books, by tranſcribing different copies: finally, in thoſe barbarous times, when all nations were ſo miſerable, it was a great conſolation to find in cloiſters a ſecure retreat againſt tyranny.

In France and Germany more than one biſhop went to battle with their ſerfs. Charlemagne, in a letter to one of his wives, called Fraſtada, mentions a biſhop who had valiantly fought at his ſide in a battle againſt the Avares, a people deſcended from the Scythians, who inhabited the country now called Auſtria. I find in his time no fewer than fourteen monaſteries, which were obliged to find a certain number of ſoldiers. If an abbot had the leaſt turn for a military life, nothing hindered him from conducting them in perſon. True it is, in the year 803, a parliament complained to Charlemagne of the great number of prieſts who had been ſlain in battle: then the miniſters of the altar were forbid to expoſe their lives

lives in the field. No perſon was permitted to call himſelf clerk without being of the clergy, or to wear the tonſure unleſs he belonged to a biſhop. Theſe clerks were called Acephales; and they were puniſhed as vagabonds: but people were then altogether ignorant of that ſtation ſo common in our days, which is neither ſecular nor eccleſiaſtic. The title of Abbé, which ſignifies father, belonged to none but the heads of monaſteries.

The abbots, even then, had the paſtoral ſtaff, which was borne by the biſhops, and had been formerly the badge of the pontifical dignity in pagan Rome. Such was the power exerciſed over the monks by thoſe abbots, that they ſometimes condemned them to the moſt cruel corporal pains. They adopted the barbarous cuſtom practiſed by the Greek emperors, of burning out their eyes; and it was found neceſſary that a council ſhould prohibit this outrage, which they began to conſider as a right appertaining to their dignity.

The maſs was different from what it now is, and ſtill more different from what it had been originally: at firſt it was a ſupper; afterwards, the majeſty of worſhip increaſing with the number of the faithful, it became gradually what is now called high-maſs. There was only a common maſs in every church before the fifth century. The name of Synaxis, which it has among the Greeks, and which ſignifies a congregation; the formularies that ſubſiſt and are addreſſed to this congregation, plainly prove that private maſſes muſt have been long unknown. The ſacrifice, the aſſembly, and the common prayer, were diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Miſſa* among the Latins, becauſe, according to ſome authors, the penitents who did not communicate were ſent back, *mittebantur*; and in the opinion of others, becauſe the communion was ſent, *miſſa erat*, to thoſe who could not come to church.

When the number of prieſts increaſed, they were obliged to ſay private maſſes: men of fortune maintained chaplains. Agobert, biſhop of Lions, complained of this practice in the ninth century. Dionyſius the Little, in his collection of canons, and many others, con-

firms the opinion that all the faithful communicated at public maſs. In his time they brought along with them the bread and the wine, which the prieſt conſecrated, and each received the bread in his own hands: this bread was unfermented, and not yet leavened; and they gave it even to children. The communion in both ſpecies was an univerſal cuſtom under Charlemagne; it is ſtill preſerved among the Greeks, and it continued among the Latins till the twelfth century: we find that even in the thirteenth it was ſometimes practiſed. The author of the relation of the victory obtained in the year 1264, by Charles of Anjou over Mainfroy, records, that the knights communicated with bread and wine before the battle. The cuſtom of ſoaking the bread in the wine, was eſtabliſhed before the time of Charlemagne; that of ſucking the wine through a reed or metal ſyphon, was not introduced till about two hundred years after this period; and was very ſoon aboliſhed. All theſe rites and practices were changed, according to the circumſtances of the times, and at the diſcretion of the paſtors.

The Latin was the only church that prayed in a foreign language, unknown to the people. This ſeeming inconſiſtency was occaſioned by the inundations of barbarians, who introduced their idioms into Europe. The Latins were as yet the only Chriſtians who conferred baptiſm by ſimple aſperſion, a very natural indulgence to children born in the ſevere northern climates, and decently ſuitable to the warm climate of Italy. The ceremony for grown perſons was not the ſame with that for children: the difference was pointed out by nature.

Auricular confeſſion is ſaid to have been introduced as early as the ſixth century. The biſhops at firſt exacted of their canons that they ſhould confeſs to them twice a-year, in conſequence of the canons enacted by the council of Atigny, in the year 763; and this is the firſt time that it was expreſsly commanded. The abbots ſubjected their monks to this yoke which was by little and little impoſed upon the laity. Public confeſſion was never uſed in the Weſt; for by that time the barbarians

barians embraced Chriſtianity, the abuſe and ſcandal with which it was attended had aboliſhed it in the Eaſt, under the patriarch Nectarius, at the end of the fourth century; but public ſinners frequently did public penance in the churches of the Weſt, eſpecially in Spain, where the invaſion of the Saracens redoubled the fervour of the Chriſtians, whom they had humbled. 'Till the twelfth century, I find no traces of the form of confeſſion, nor of the confeſſionals eſtabliſhed in churches; nor of the previous neceſſity of confeſſing immediately before the communion. In the eighth and ninth centuries there were three Lents, and people generally confeſſed at theſe three ſeaſons of the year. The commandments of the church, which were not well underſtood till after the fourth council of the Lateran, in the year 1215, impoſed the neceſſity of doing that once a-year, which before ſeems to have been more arbitrary and unſettled.

In the time of Charlemagne the army was provided with confeſſors. Charles had one for himſelf by the expreſs title of his office; his name was Waldon, and he was abbot of Augi, near Conſtance.

Any perſon was allowed to confeſs to a layman, and even to a woman in caſe of neceſſity; and this permiſſion was of long ſtanding. Thus Joinville tells us, that when he was in Africa, he confeſſed a knight, and gave him abſolution, according to the power with which he was veſted. "It is not altogether a ſacrament (ſays St. Thomas) but it reſembles a ſacrament."

Confeſſion may be regarded as the moſt effectual reſtraint upon ſecret crimes. The ſages of antiquity had embraced the ſhadow of this ſalutary practice. Confeſſion was uſed in expiations among the Ægyptians and the Greeks, and in almoſt all the celebrations of their myſteries. Marcus Aurelius, when admitted into the myſteries of the Eleuſian Ceres, confeſſed himſelf to the Hierophantes *.

This cuſtom, ſo piouſly eſtabliſhed among Chriſtians, was afterwards unhappily the occaſion of ſome fatal

* The chief prieſt, or he who ſhewed the ſacred myſteries.

abuſes; eſpecially during the diſſenſions between the emperors and the popes, and in the factions of cities, when the prieſts abſolutely refuſed abſolution to thoſe who were not of their own party. This is what was ſeen in France, in the reign of Henry IV. when almoſt all the fathers confeſſors refuſed abſolution to thoſe ſubjects who acknowledged their lawful ſovereign. Such is the deplorable condition of mankind, that the moſt divine remedies are often converted into the moſt deadly poiſon.

The Chriſtian religion had not yet extended northwards, farther than the conqueſts of Charlemagne. Scandinavia and Denmark, which was at that time called the country of the Normans, were plunged into the groſſeſt idolatry. They worſhipped Woden, and fancied, that after death, the happineſs of man conſiſted in carouſing in the hall of Woden, and drinking beer out of the ſculls of their enemies. We have ſtill extant tranſlations of ſome of their old ballads, in which this notion is expreſſed: it was a great deal for them even to believe a future ſtate. Poland was equally ſavage and idolatrous. The Muſcovites, as barbarous as the reſt of Tartary, ſcarce knew enough to be ranked among Pagans; yet all theſe nations lived peaceably in their ignorance: happy in being unknown to Charlemagne, who ſold ſo dear the knowledge of Chriſtianity!

The Engliſh began to receive the Chriſtian religion, which had been lately carried thither by Conſtantius Chlorus, the ſecret protector of that faith which was then under perſecution. There, however, it did not prevail; idolatry, for a long time, had the aſcendant. Some miſſionaries from Gaul, indeed, rudely inſtructed a ſmall number of thoſe iſlanders *. The famous Pelagius, too zealous a defender of human nature, was born, though

* Our author ſeems to be wholly ignorant of the Britiſh church, which was eſtabliſhed ſoon after the beginning of the fourth century: as appears from the hiſtory of the council of Arles, to which three Britiſh biſhops ſubſcribed by the names of Eborius, Reſtitutus, and Adelfius, *de civitate coloniæ Londinenſium.*

though not educated, in England: we muſt, therefore, reckon him among the natives of Rome †.

Ireland, diſtinguiſhed by the name of Scotland; and Scotland, known by the appellation of Albany, or the country of the Picts, had likewiſe received ſome ſeeds of Chriſtianity, choaked, however, by idolatry, that ſtill predominated. The monk Columba ‡ was born in Ireland, in the ſixth century; but it appears from his retreat to France, and the monaſteries he founded in Burgundy, that there was very little to be done, and a great deal to be feared, by thoſe who ſought in Ireland and England for thoſe rich and quiet eſtabliſhments, that were found in other countries, under the ſhelter of religion. After an almoſt total extinction of Chriſtianity in England, Scotland, and Ireland, it was revived by conjugal tenderneſs. Ethelbert, one of the barbarous Anglo-Saxon ſovereigns of the Heptarchy in England, whoſe petty kingdom was the province of Kent, where Canterbury ſtands, was deſirous of being allied to a monarch of France, and married a daughter of Childebert, king of Paris. This Chriſtian princeſs, who croſſed the ſea, attended by the biſhop of Soiſſons, diſpoſed her huſband to receive baptiſm, in the ſame manner as Clovis had been ſubdued by Clotilda. In the year 598, pope Gregory the Great ſent thither Auguſtin, with ſome other Roman monks; but they met with little ſucceſs in converting the people ‖; for one muſt, at leaſt, underſtand the language of the country, before

† It does not appear, by any authentic hiſtory, that Pelagius was not educated in Britain. His real name was Morgan. He lived in the beginning of the fifth century, and made a conſiderable figure both in Italy and Paleſtine.

‡ St. Columba was born in the province of Leinſter, in the year 559. At the age of thirty, he repaired to France, where he met with an honourable reception from Childebert II. He founded ſeveral monaſteries; and being obliged to leave France, retired to Lombardy, where he died in the abbey of Bobio, of which he himſelf had been the founder.

‖ St. Auguſtin and his companions met with ſurpriſing ſucceſs in converting the Engliſh. The pope, in a letter, congratulates him upon it, and expreſſes his hope that he will bear it with moderation.

he can hope to change the religion of the natives: nevertheleſs, they were enabled, by the queen's favour, to build a monaſtery.

It was properly the queen who converted the little kingdom of Canterbury: the barbarous ſubjects, who had no opinions of their own, implicitly followed the example of their ſovereigns. This Auguſtin found no great difficulty in prevailing upon Gregory the Great, to declare him primate. He wanted to be metropolitan of the Gauls; but Gregory gave him to underſtand, that he could only inveſt him with the juriſdiction over England: he was, therefore, firſt archbiſhop of Canterbury, and firſt primate of England. One of his monks he created biſhop of London, and to another he gave the biſhopric of Rocheſter; but we cannot compare theſe biſhops to any thing better than to the prelates of Antioch and Babylon, who are termed biſhops *in partibus infidelium*. In time, the Engliſh hierarchy was formed; their monaſteries, in particular, were extremely rich in the eighth and ninth centuries. They enrolled, in the catalogue of ſaints, all the great lords from whom they had received benefactions; hence we find among their ſaints of thoſe times, ſeven kings, as many queens, eight princes, and ſixteen princeſſes. Their chronicles relate, that ten kings and eleven queens ended their days in cloiſters. It is probable that theſe ten kings and eleven queens cauſed themſelves, in their laſt moments, to be clad in religious habits, and, perhaps, to be carried into convents; but it is hardly credible that, in good health, they actually renounced the affairs of the public, in order to live the life of a recluſe †.

CHAP.

† It is true, nevertheleſs. The famous Ina, king of Weſſex, turned monk at Rome, and his queen Ethelburga retired into a monaſtery at Barking. This was the caſe with Cealwulph and Edgbert, kings of Northumberland, Sigebert of Eaſt Anglia, Ethelred, Sebba, and Offa, ſovereigns of Mercia, and others of a latter date.

CHAP. XIII.

Sequel of the Customs that prevailed in the Time of Charlemagne.

Of Juſtice; of the Laws; of particular Cuſtoms.

THE counts appointed by the king, adminiſtered juſtice in a ſummary manner. Each had his ſeparate diſtrict aſſigned to him; and they were obliged to be well verſed in the laws, which were neither ſo difficult nor ſo numerous as thoſe under which we now live. The proceſs was altogether ſimple: every man pleaded his own cauſe in France and Germany. Rome alone, and the countries that depended upon her, ſtill retained many laws and forms of the Roman empire. The Lombard laws prevailed in other parts of Hither Italy.

Every count had under him a lieutenant, called Viguier, ſeven Scabini or aſſeſſors, and a ſecretary, Notarius. The counts, in their ſeveral juriſdictions, publiſhed the order of march in time of war, enrolled the ſoldiers under the reſpective captains, and conducted them to the rendezvous, leaving their lieutenants to adminiſter juſtice in their abſence.

The kings ſent commiſſaries with letters patent, *miſſi Dominici*, who examined the conduct of the counts. Neither theſe commiſſaries, nor the counts, except very rarely, condemned criminals to death, or torture: for, excluſive of Saxony, where Charlemagne enacted ſanguinary laws, almoſt all ſorts of crimes were bought off, through the reſt of the empire. Rebellion alone was puniſhed with death; and the kings reſerved the trial to themſelves. The Salique law, together with thoſe of the Lombards and the Ripuarii, ſet a pecuniary fine upon moſt other crimes, as we have already obſerved.

Their

Their juriſprudence, however, which at firſt ſight appears to have been humane, was, in fact, more cruel than ours. It left every man at liberty to do miſchief, who could afford to pay for the crimes he had committed. The moſt gentle law is that which prevents guilt, by laying the moſt terrible reſtriction upon iniquity.

Among the Salique laws which were revived by Charlemagne, there is one that ſtrongly marks the contempt into which the Romans were fallen among thoſe barbarous nations. The Frank who had killed a Roman citizen paid but one thouſand and fifty deniers; whereas the Roman paid two thouſand and five hundred for having embrued his hands in the blood of a Frank.

In criminal cauſes that could not be determined by evidence, the parties purged themſelves by oath. The defendant was obliged not only to ſwear himſelf, but likewiſe to produce a certain number of witneſſes to ſwear with him. When both parties oppoſed oath to oath, the cauſe was ſometimes determined by duel, either with a pointed iron, or with the ſword, to extremity.

Theſe duels were called, as every body knows, The judgment of God: ſuch was the name beſtowed upon one of the moſt deplorable follies of that barbarous government. The accuſed were likewiſe ſubject to the proof, by cold water, boiling water, and red hot iron. The celebrated Stephen Balure has collected all the antient ceremonies of thoſe trials. They began with the maſs, and the defendant received the communion. The cold water was firſt bleſſed and then exorciſed. The accuſed perſon being fettered, was thrown into the water: if he ſunk to the bottom, he was deemed innocent: if he floated, he was pronounced guilty. M. de Fleury, in his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory ſays, it was a ſure method of not finding any perſon criminal. For my own part, I dare believe it was a method by which many innocent perſons periſhed. There are many men whoſe cheſts are ſo large, and whoſe lungs are ſo light, that they will not ſink to the bottom, eſpecially when they are bound with many turns of a thick rope, which, together with the body, forms a volume

volume ſpecifically lighter than water *. This unhappy cuſtom, which was in the ſequel prohibited in the great cities, has been preſerved even to our days in many provinces. It has been often impoſed even by the judge's ſentence, upon thoſe who paſſed for wizards; for nothing laſts ſo long as ſuperſtition; and it has been the death of many unfortunate wretches.

The judgment of God by hot water was executed by cauſing the accuſed perſon to plunge his naked arm into a tub of boiling water. He was obliged to take up a conſecrated ring from the bottom. The judge, in preſence of the prieſts and people, wrapped up the patient's arm in a bag which was ſealed with his own ſeal; and if in three days after the trial, no mark of ſcalding appeared on the arm, his innocence was acknowledged.

All the hiſtorians relate the example of queen † Teutberga, daughter-in-law to the emperor Lotharius, grandſon of Charlemagne, who was accuſed of having committed inceſt with her brother, though a monk and ſub-deacon. She nominated a champion, who in her ſtead underwent the trial of boiling water, in preſence of a numerous court; and took up the ring without being in the leaſt injured. Certain it is, there are ſecrets that enable perſons to bear the action of the fire for ſome ſeconds without being hurt. I have ſeen inſtances of this nature. Theſe ſecrets were then more common, as they were then more neceſſary; but there is none that can render us abſolutely impaſſible. In all probability,

* This is a childiſh obſervation, which will not hold true in fact. Our author ſeems to be but little acquainted with natural philoſophy; for he ſays, "forms a volume leſs heavy than an equal quantity of water." Now it is well known that the quantity of water is altogether out of the queſtion with reſpect to bodies immerſed, whether they are put into a tub of twenty inches diameter, or plunged into the Atlantic ocean.

† Her name was Thietberga, daughter of Hubert, duke de Outre-le-mont-jou. She was alſo called Bercinda. Lotharius, her huſband, repudiated her, and married Waldrada, the ſiſter of Gonthier, archbiſhop of Cologne; but pope Nicholas I. obliged him to diſmiſs this new wife, and take back his former queen, whom he treated with great cruelty, and accuſed of adultery.

probability, upon thoſe ſtrange trials, the proof was inflicted in a manner more or leſs rigorous, according as the judge deſired to condemn or acquit the perſon accuſed.

This trial by boiling water was particularly appointed for the conviction of adulterers. Theſe cuſtoms were more antient and extenſive than they are commonly imagined. Women accuſed among the Jews, were ſubjected by the law of Moſes to the proof of the waters of jealouſy. They drank, in preſence of the prieſts, ſome water in which a little conſecrated aſhes had been thrown: and this water, which was ſalutary to innocents, made the guilty ſwell and burſt upon the ſpot.

The learned very well know, that in Sicily the perſon accuſed wrote his oath in the temple of the gods called Palici *. This was thrown into a baſon of water, and if it floated he was acquitted. The temple of Træzenum † was famous for the like trials. At the extremity of the Eaſt, in Japan, we ſtill find ſuch cuſtoms, founded on the ſimplicity of the primitive times; and that ſuperſtition which is common to all nations. The third proof was that of a red hot bar of iron, to be carried in the naked hand for the ſpace of nine paces. It was more difficult to deceive the ſpectator in this than in the other trials; therefore I do not find that any perſon ſubmitted to it even in thoſe times of ignorance.

With

* The gods Palici were twin-ſons of Jupiter by the nymph Thalia: according to the Heathen mythology, they were begotten on the banks of the river Simethus, near Catanea in Sicily. Thalia finding herſelf pregnant, prayed to the earth to ſwallow her up. Her prayer was heard; ſhe brought forth the twins, and the earth diſcharged them from her bowels by a ſecond opening. From this double birth they acquired the name Palici, from παλιν *rurſus, again*. At theſe openings appeared two ſmall lakes, on the waters of which the above trial was made: though others alledge that the accuſed perſon, after having given ſufficient ſecurity, threw himſelf into the lake; if he ſwam on the ſurface, he was acquitted: if he was drowned, his bail was condemned.

† Træzenum is a town of Peloponneſus, now called Pleda. It was famous for a temple dedicated to Minerva the Deceiver, at whoſe ſhrine the maidens offered up their girdles before marriage.

With regard to the civil laws, the moſt remarkable, in my opinion, was that by which a man who had no iſſue of his own, was at liberty to adopt children. Married men could repudiate their wives in courſe of law; and, after the divorce, they were allowed to contract other conjugal engagements. Marculfus has given us a detail of theſe laws: but what will perhaps appear more aſtoniſhing, though not the leſs true, is, that in the ſecond book of thoſe formularies publiſhed by Marculfus, we find that nothing was more commonly allowed or practiſed, than a deviation from that famous Salique law, by which daughters were excluded from inheritance. A man brought his daughter before the court or commiſſary, and pronounced words to this effect: "My dear daughter, An antient and impious cuſtom which prevails among us, deprives female children of all paternal inheritance; having conſidered this impiety, I am of opinion, that as you have been all equally beſtowed upon me by God, I ought to love you all alike: therefore, dear daughter, it is my will that you ſhould inherit by equal portions, with your brothers, in all my lands, &c." Among the Franks, who lived according to the Salique and the Ripuary laws, the diſtinction was not known of noblemen and plebeians; of noblemen *ab avo*, or perſons who lived like the nobility. There were but two ranks of people, thoſe that were free, and the ſerfs, nearly the ſame as at this day in the Mahometan empires, and in China. The term Nobilis is but once employed in the capitularies, and that is in the fifth book, to ſignify the officers, the counts, and the centurions. All the cities of Italy and France were governed by their own municipal laws. The tributes they paid to their ſovereigns conſiſted in Fœderum, Paratum, and Manſionaticum, forage, proviſions and furniture. For a long time, the emperors and kings maintained their dignity with their own demeſnes, and theſe taxes paid in kind when they travelled. There is ſtill extant a capitulary of Charlemagne concerning his farms. He there enters into the moſt circumſtantial detail; and ordains that an exact account of his flocks ſhould be duly delivered. One of the principal articles of wealth in the country,

country, conſiſted of bees. In a word, the moſt important affairs, and the moſt inconſiderable matters of thoſe times, make us acquainted with laws, manners, and cuſtoms, of which ſcarce any traces now remain.

CHAP. XIV.

LEWIS the FEEBLE, or the DEBONNAIRE *.

THE hiſtory of the great events of this world is ſcarce any thing but a detail of crimes. I do not find any age which the ambition of the laity and the clergy has not filled with horrors. Charlemagne was hardly in his grave, when his family and empire were deſolated by a civil war.

The archbiſhops of Milan and Cremona were the firſt that kindled the flame, on pretence that Bernard, king of Italy, was chief of the Carlovingian houſe, as being the eldeſt ſon of Charlemagne. The true reaſon, however, is eaſily found in that turbulency of ſpirit and mad ambition which avails itſelf of the very laws made to ſuppreſs it. A biſhop of Orleans entered into their intrigues, and both the uncle and nephew levied troops, and were ready to come to an engagement at Chalons on the Saone; but the emperor, partly by money, and partly by promiſes, found means to gain over one-half of the Italian army. Negotiations were now ſet on foot; or, in other words, each ſide endeavoured to cheat the other. Lewis, ſurnamed le Faible, on account of his being a weak prince, and who was cruel merely from that weakneſs, cauſed his nephew's eyes to be put out, though he begged for mercy upon his knees. The unhappy king died three days after this cruel act, of the torments he ſuffered in his mind and body. He was buried at Milan, with this inſcription engraved on his tomb; "Here lies Bernard of holy memory." It would ſeem that this epithet holy was in thoſe times uſed

* There is no Engliſh word that expreſſes Debonnaire. It ſignifies good-natured, liberal, and graceful. This prince was alſo called Lewis the Devout.

uſed as a mere honorary title. After this, Lewis cauſed three of his own brothers to be ſhaven and ſhut up in a monaſtery; being apprehenſive leſt the blood of Charlemagne ſhould command too much reſpect, and light up commotions in the ſtate. But this was not all: the emperor cauſed all Bernard's friends whom that prince had diſcovered, in hopes of their obtaining mercy, to be arreſted: theſe met with the ſame puniſhment as their king, the clergy only being excepted out of the ſentence. Thus thoſe were ſpared who had been the chief authors of the war, and met with no other chaſtiſement than depoſition or baniſhment. Lewis kept fair with the church; and the church ſoon made him ſenſible that he ought to have been leſs cruel and more reſolute.

In 817 Lewis followed his father's ill example, in giving kingdoms to his children; and not having either the courage or underſtanding of his father, nor that authority which courage beſtows, he expoſed himſelf to the effects of ingratitude; and though too cruel an uncle, and too ſevere a brother, he was too indulgent a father.

Having made his eldeſt ſon Lotharius his colleague with him in the empire, given Aquitain to the ſecond, named Pepin; and Bavaria to Lewis his third ſon, there ſtill remained an infant whom he had had by a new wife *: this was Charles the Bald, who afterwards came to be emperor: having provided for his other ſons, he was reſolved not to leave this child, the ſon of a wife he loved, deſtitute of dominions.

One of the ſources of Lewis's misfortunes, and of the number of ſtill greater diſaſters which have ſince diſturbed Europe, was the abuſe which then began to take its riſe, of granting worldly power to thoſe who had renounced the world.

This

* After the death of the empreſs Hermengard, his miniſters, in order to divert him from a life of privacy, to which he was inclined, prevailed upon him to marry Judith, daughter of duke Guelfe, deſcended by father and mother from the dukes of Bavaria and Saxony. This marriage was the ſource of all his ſucceeding misfortunes.

This memorable ſcene was opened by one Vala, abbot of Corbie, a relation of the emperor's, a man outrageous through a warmth of zeal or ſpirit of faction, or perhaps both together; and one of the heads of a party which has been ſo frequently known to cauſe the greateſt evils, by preaching up too rigid a virtue, and to throw every thing into confuſion, by pretending to reduce all to rule.

In a parliament held at Aix-la-chapelle, in the year 829, a parliament to which abbots had been admitted, as being lords of very large manors, this Vala openly reproved the emperor as the cauſe of all the diſorders in the ſtate. "It is you, ſaid he, that are guilty of them." He then proceeded to addreſs himſelf to each member in particular, in a ſtill more ſeditious manner, and had even the inſolence to accuſe the empreſs Judith of adultery. He ſtrove to prevent and hinder the gifts which the emperor had reſolved to beſtow on the ſon he had by this empreſs; thus he went on diſturbing the peace and honour of the royal family, and conſequently the ſtate, under the pretext of promoting its welfare.

The emperor being at laſt enraged at theſe proceedings, ſent Vala back to his convent, from whence he ought never to have come out; and reſolving to ſatisfy his wife, gave the ſon he had by her a ſmall part of Germany, towards the Rhine, which is now called Switzerland, and the Franche Comté.

If the laws of Europe had been founded on paternal authority; and if every mind had been penetrated with a due ſenſe of the neceſſity of filial reſpect, as the firſt of all duties, as I have already ſhewn to be the caſe in China, the three children of the emperor, who had received their crowns from him, would never have rebelled againſt their father; for beſtowing an inheritance on a child by a ſecond marriage.

At firſt they ſhewed their diſcontent by murmuring; immediately upon this, the abbot of Corbie, joined with the abbot of St. Denis, a man of a ſtill more factious ſpirit; and who, by poſſeſſing the abbeys of St. Medard, Soiſſons, and St. Germain-des-prez, was able to raiſe troops; which he accordingly did. The biſhops of Vienne,

enne, Lyons, and Amiens, uniting with theſe monks, puſhed on the princes to engage in a civil war, and declared all who refuſed to join them, rebels to God and the church. In vain did Lewis, inſtead of raiſing an army, convoke four councils, in which were made ſome good but neceſſary laws: his three ſons had recourſe to arms; and, I believe, this is the firſt inſtance we have of three ſons joining in rebellion againſt their father. The emperor himſelf at length took up arms, and two camps were ſeen filled with biſhops, abbots, and monks: but Gregory IV. declaring on the ſide of the princes, his name added great weight to their party. It was already become the intereſt of the popes to humble the emperors. One Stephen, Gregory's predeceſſor, had already been inſtalled in the pontifical chair, without the conſent of Lewis the Feeble; and the raiſing diſputes between the father and his children ſeemed a ready means of aggrandizing themſelves on their ruins. Pope Gregory then came to France, and threatened the emperor with excommunication, a ceremony which did not, at that time, carry the ſame idea which has been ſince affixed to it; no one then daring to pretend that an excommunicated perſon was to be deprived of his poſſeſſions by excommunication alone. Their intent was to render the party execrable, and cut aſunder by the ſword all the bands which could attach mankind to him.

The biſhops of the emperor's party made uſe of their privilege, and boldly told the pope, *Si excommunicaturus veniet, excommunicatus abibit*; "That if he came to excommunicate, he himſelf would return excommunicated." They wrote to him with a noble freedom, treating him indeed like a pope, but at the ſame time like a brother. Gregory, ſtill more haughty than they, wrote back to them in theſe words: "The term brother expreſſes too great an equality; adhere to that of pope; acknowledge my ſuperiority, and know that the authority of my chair is above that of Lewis's throne." In ſhort, in this letter he evaded the oath he had taken to the emperor.

In the midſt of this war they entered upon negotiations. The pontiff made himſelf arbiter, and went to meet

meet the emperor in his camp, where he had the ſame advantage that Lewis formerly had over Bernard; he ſeduced his troops, or at leaſt ſuffered them to be ſeduced; and deceived Lewis, or was deceived himſelf by the rebels in whoſe name he came to ſpeak; and ſcarce had he left the camp, when the very ſame night one half of the emperor's army went over to his ſon Lotharius. This deſertion happened near Baſil,
830 and the plain where the pope carried on this negotiation is ſtill called "The field of Lies." In this ſituation the unhappy monarch was obliged to ſurrender himſelf priſoner to his rebellious children, together with the empreſs Judith, his wife, the principal object of their hatred: he delivered up to them his ſon Charles, then only ten years old, and the innocent pretence for this war. In more barbarous times, like thoſe of Clovis and his children, or in a country ſuch as Conſtantinople, I ſhould not have wondered if they had put Judith and her ſon, and even the emperor himſelf to death; but here the conquerors contented themſelves with ordering the empreſs to be ſhaven and confined in priſon in Lombardy *; with ſhutting up young Charles in the convent of Prum, which is ſituated in the middle of the foreſt of Ardes; and with obliging their father to abdicate the throne. Methinks, in reading the diſaſters

* Here our author is miſtaken in the date; and ſeems to have confounded two events together. True it is, in this year 830, the empreſs Judith was ſurpriſed at Leon by a detachment from the army of Pepin, who, after having inſulted her with reproaches, told her ſhe had no other way of eſcaping death but that of taking the veil; and perſuading his father the emperor to receive the tonſure. He ſent her to the camp of Lewis with theſe propoſals, which were refuſed; and ſhe being weak enough to return with his anſwer, was veiled in the monaſtery of St. Radigonde, in Poitiers. The emperor's affairs taking a more favourable turn in the ſequel, ſhe was brought from thence, and three years after involved in her huſband's ſecond diſaſter, as it is here related. The emperor was depoſed, and ſhe baniſhed to Tortona in the Milaneſe. It does not however appear that the pope was concerned in debauching the emperor's army; at leaſt this circumſtance is not mentioned by the hiſtorians whoſe works we have ſeen. *Theg. de geſtis Ludovici pii—Vita Valæ abbatii, Epiſt. Pap. Greg.* IV. *Nithard de diſſentionibus filiorum Ludovici pii. Daniel Hiſt. de France, &c.*

aſters which befel this too affectionate parent, we muſt at leaſt feel a ſecret ſatisfaction in ſeeing his unnatural ſons behave no leſs ungratefully towards the abbot Vala, who was the firſt author of all theſe troubles; and to the pope, who had ſo effectually carried them on. The pontiff returned to Rome, deſpiſed by the conquerors, and Vala ſhut himſelf up in a monaſtery in Italy.

Lotharius, who was ſo much the more culpable as he had been made co-partner in the empire, dragged his father as a priſoner to Compeigne. There had been at that time a fatal abuſe introduced into the church, which forbade the carrying arms, or the exerciſing any of the civil functions during the time of public penance. Theſe penances were ſeldom practiſed, and rarely fell upon any beſides ſome unhappy wretches among the dregs of the people. It was however reſolved that the emperor ſhould undergo this infamous puniſhment, under the colour of a voluntary and Chriſtian act of humiliation; and to impoſe upon him a perpetual penance that would degrade him for ever.

Lewis intimidated, had the meanneſs to conſent to this propoſal, which was ſo inſolent in them to make. An archbiſhop of Rheims, named Hebo, who had been raiſed from a ſervile condition to this dignity by Lewis himſelf, contrary to the laws, was the perſon pitched upon to depoſe his ſovereign and benefactor. The emperor was obliged to make his appearance, ſurrounded by thirty biſhops, canons, and monks, in the church of Nôtre Dame, of Soiſſons. His ſon Lotharius was preſent at this ceremony, and ſeemed to take an unnatural pleaſure in the humiliation of his father. A hair-cloth was ſpread before the altar; and the archbiſhop ordered the emperor to take off his belt, ſword, and coat, and proſtrate himſelf on the hair-cloth. Lewis, with his face to the earth, aſked for public penance, which he too well deſerved for his meanneſs in ſubmitting to it *. The

* The emperor being accuſed in an aſſembly of the prelates and nobility, of certain crimes againſt the church and ſtate, the biſhops enjoined him a canonical penance for the reſt of his life, and this was

The archbiſhop then obliged him to read aloud a paper in which he was accuſed of ſacrilege and murder; and the unhappy prince read deliberately the liſt of his crimes, among which it is expreſsly mentioned, that he had cauſed his troops to march in Lent, and had called a parliament on Holy Thurſday. A verbal proceſs was prepared of the whole action, which ſtill ſubſiſts a monument of inſolence and meanneſs. In this proceſs they do not ſo much as deign to give Lewis the title of emperor: he is there called Dominus Ludovicus, a nobleman, a venerable perſon.

It has always been cuſtomary to ſupport extraordinary proceedings by ſome former examples. The penance performed by Lewis, was authoriſed by the precedent of a certain king of the Viſigoths, named Vamba, who reigned in Spain in the year 681, and who, growing weak and childiſh, had public penance inflicted on him by a council held at Toledo, after which he retired to a cloiſter, and his ſon Herviquez, who ſucceeded him, acknowledged that he held his crown of the biſhops. This fact was cited on this occaſion, as if any example could juſtify a villainous procedure. They likewiſe alledged the penance of the emperor Theodoſius; but this was a very different caſe. Theodoſius had cauſed fifteen thouſand of the inhabitants of Theſſalonica to be maſſacred, not from a ſudden emotion of anger, as is ſo falſely and repeatedly aſſerted by a number of writers, but in conſequence of a long and cool reflection *. This deliberate piece of cruelty juſtly drew upon him the vengeance

was the moſt effectual expedient they could have choſen againſt his reſuming the ſovereignty: for by the canons of the church it was decreed, that, during the time of penance, the penitent was not permitted to bear arms, nor to concern himſelf in public affairs. Another, perhaps ſtronger ſecurity they derived from his own ſuperſtition, which was ſo great, that he had formerly, of his own accord, done public penance for his cruelty to his nephew Bernard, king of Italy.

* It was in the year 390, that the emperor Theodoſius, ſurnamed the Great, was ſo incenſed againſt the inhabitants of Theſſalonica, who in a ſedition had murdered one of his generals, that he abandoned the city to the revenge of his troops, who maſſacred fifteen thouſand

vengeance of a people who had not choſen him to be their butcher. St. Ambroſe did a moſt noble action in refuſing him entrance into the church; and Theodoſius was no leſs prudent in endeavouring to alleviate the hatred of the empire againſt him, by forbearing to enter the church during eight months; a poor and inſufficient atonement for the moſt atrocious piece of wickedneſs that ever ſullied the royal character.

Lewis † was confined for a year in a cell in the convent of St. Medard of Soiſſons, cloathed in ſackcloth, as a penitent, without ſervants, without conſolation, and dead to the reſt of the world. If he had had but one ſon he had been loſt for ever; but his three ſons quarrelling about the ſpoils they had ſtript him of, their diſſenſions reſtored the father to his liberty and crown.

Having been ſent to St. Denis, two of his ſons, Lewis and Pepin, went thither to replace him on the throne, and reſtore to his arms his wife and ſon Charles. The aſſembly of Soiſſons was anathematized by another at Thionville; but it coſt the archbiſhop of Rheims only the loſs of his ſee; moreover, he was only tried and depoſed in the veſtry; whereas the emperor had been publicly degraded at the foot of the altar. Some other biſhops were likewiſe depoſed. The emperor either would not, or durſt not, inflict any greater puniſhment on them. 834

Soon after, Lewis of Bavaria, one of the ſame ſons who had re-eſtabliſhed him on the throne, rebelled againſt him again: this ſecond defection touched the unhappy father ſo nearly, that he died with vexation, in a tent near Mentz, ſaying, "I forgive Lewis, but let him know that he has been the cauſe of my death." June 20, 840.

It

thouſand perſons in cold blood. Some time after Theodoſius being at Milan, and going to church, St. Ambroſius ordered the gate to be ſhut, and would not allow him to enter until he had done penance for eight months.

† The misfortunes of Lewis were not more owing to the ambition and inſolence of the clergy, than to the influence of his firſt wife, which induced him to make an impolitic diviſion of the empire, and the intrigues of the ſecond, who was equally artful and turbulent.

. It is ſaid that he confirmed in a ſolemn manner, by his laſt will, the donation made by Pepin and Charlemagne to the church of Rome.

This confirmation is liable to the ſame doubts as the gifts which it tends to ratify. It can hardly be thought that Charlemagne and his ſon ſhould have made a preſent to the pope of Venice, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corſica, countries to which they had at beſt but a precarious claim to the ſovereign juriſdiction. And at what time could Lewis diſpoſe of Sicily, which belonged to the Greek emperors, and was moreover infeſted by the continual inroads of the Barbarians?

CHAP. XV.

Of the State of EUROPE, after the Death of LEWIS the DEBONNAIRE, or the FEEBLE.

AFTER the death of Charlemagne's ſon, his empire ſuffered the ſame fate as that of Alexander; and, as will hereafter be ſeen, befel that of the caliphs. Founded on a ſudden, on a ſudden it ſunk to ruin; being rent and divided by inteſtine wars.

It is not to be wondered at, that princes who had dethroned their own father, ſhould be for getting rid of one another; each ſtrove to ſtrip his brother; the emperor Lotharius was for getting all into his own hands. Charles the Bald *, king of France, and Lewis king of Bavaria, joined together to oppoſe him. A ſon of Pepin, king of Aquitain, (who was ſon to Lewis the Debonnaire,

* By a partition made in the life of his father, with the conſent of Lotharius, and by a ſubſequent agreement with this laſt, Charles the Bald was left in poſſeſſion of great part of the country now called France. Lotharius the emperor reigned over Italy, and all the country between the Rhine and the Schelde, Hainault and Cambreſis; his empire likewiſe extended from the ſource of the Meuſe to the conflux of the Saone and the Rhone, and on both ſides of the Rhone as far as the ſea. Lewis king of Bavaria ruled beyond the Rhine, and therefore acquired the name of king of Germany.

naire, and king after the death of his father) joined Lotharius. Theſe laid the empire waſte, and drained it of its ſoldiers. In fine, two kings oppoſed againſt two kings, and three of theſe brothers, and the other nephew to them all, gave each other battle at Fontenoy, in the Auxerrois, with a fury truly worthy of a civil war. Several authors affirm, that upwards of an hundred thouſand men periſhed in this action. Indeed we are ſure that theſe writers were not cotemporaries, and are therefore at liberty to doubt whether ſo much blood was really ſhed. This engagement ended in the defeat of Lotharius, who afterwards gave the world an example of a policy quite the reverſe to that of Charlemagne. 841 842

The conqueror of the Saxons had obliged them to ſubmit to Chriſtianity, as a neceſſary curb; but their frequent revolts, and continual endeavours to return to their own worſhip, gave convincing proofs of their hatred to a religion which they looked upon as their puniſhment. Lotharius, in hopes to attach them to him, granted them full liberty of conſcience: the conſequence of which was, that one half of the country relapſed into idolatry, but ſtill remained faithful to their king. The conduct of this prince, and that of his grandfather Charlemagne, may ſerve to ſhew mankind in how many different ways kings may make religion ſubſervient to their intereſts.

The misfortunes of Lotharius furniſh us with yet another example of this: his two brothers, Charles the Bald, and Lewis of Bavaria, aſſembled a council of biſhops and abbots at Aix-la-Chapelle, in which Lotharius was, by the unanimous voice of theſe prelates, declared to have forfeited his right to the crown *; and his ſubjects

* They did no more than declare he had no right to any part of France, the crown of which had, with his own conſent, been given to his brother Charles. It is true, the preſident of the aſſembly addreſſing himſelf to the two kings, on this occaſion, ſaid, "Receive the kingdom by the authority of God, and govern it according to his divine will: we adviſe you, we exhort you, we command you ſo

jects abſolved of their oath of fidelity: "Do you promiſe to govern better than he has done?" ſaid they to the two brothers. "We do," replied theſe two princes. Then ſaid the biſhop who preſided at the council, "We, by the divine authority inveſted in us, permit and command you to take the reigns of government in his ſtead."

When we ſee biſhops thus diſpoſing of crowns, we ſhould deceive ourſelves, were we to ſuppoſe that they were then what the electors of the empire are at preſent. They had great authority indeed, but none of them were ſovereign princes. The authority annexed to their character, and the veneration the people had for them, were the inſtruments made uſe of by kings to ſerve their own purpoſes. Theſe eccleſiaſtics ſhewed much more weakneſs than grandeur, in thus determining the right of kings, in ſervile compliance to the orders of the ſtronger party.

We ought not then to be ſurpriſed, that, a few years afterwards, an archbiſhop of Sens, with twenty other biſhops, ſhould have had the boldneſs, in a like conjuncture, to depoſe Charles the Bald, king of France. This audacious attempt was undertaken to pleaſe Lewis king of Bavaria. Theſe two monarchs, who were as bad kings as they had been unnatural brothers, finding themſelves not able to deſtroy each other, procured one another to be anathematized by turns; but what is really ſurpriſing, is the acknowledgment made by Charles the Bald, in a reſcript he condeſcended to publiſh againſt the archbiſhop of Sens, in theſe words: "At leaſt, the archbiſhop ought not to have proceeded to depoſe

ſo to do." This injunction, however, is very different from a permiſſion to reign in the room of their brother: it was very natural to conſult the opinions of the clergy, whether it was lawful to deprive their brother of his ſhare of the dominions in France, without however receiving them as a gift of the church; and for the reſt, the promiſe they made, to reign according to the laws of God, was no more than is exacted by the archbiſhop of Canterbury of the king of England at his coronation. Lotharius was afterwards put in poſſeſſion of the dominions he loſt by this partition, and peace re-eſtabliſhed among the three brothers.

depoſe me, before I had appeared before the biſhops who conſecrated me king: it was juſt that I ſhould firſt have undergone their cenſure, to whoſe paternal correction and chaſtiſement I was always ready to ſubmit myſelf." The race of Charlemagne reduced to ſpeak in theſe terms, were viſibly marching with long ſtrides to their ruin.

I ſhall now return to Lotharius, who had ſtill a powerful party in Germany, and remained a quiet poſſeſſor of Italy. He paſſed the Alps, and had his ſon Lewis crowned, who afterwards went to Rome to try pope Sergius II. That pontiff made his appearance, and anſwered in a formal manner to the allegations brought againſt him by the biſhop of Mentz: in the courſe of his trial he fully juſtified himſelf, and afterwards took an oath of fidelity to that very Lotharius who had been depoſed by his biſhops. Lotharius himſelf at the ſame time made that famous and uſeleſs decree, that to prevent ſeditions, which were ſo frequent at that time, the Pope ſhould no longer be elected by the people; and that the emperor ſhould henceforward be made acquainted whenever the holy ſee became vacant. 844

It may appear ſurpriſing to find this emperor, who was at times ſo humble, behaving ſo haughtily on this occaſion; but let it be conſidered, that he had an army within a little diſtance of Rome when the pope ſwore obedience to him, and had none at Aix-la-chapelle when the biſhops depoſed him.

Their decree only ſerved as an additional ſcandal to the deſolations of Europe. The provinces from the Alps to the Rhine were at a loſs to know whom they were to obey. Cities were every day changing their tyrants, and the countries round about were ravaged in turns by different parties. Nothing was to be heard of but battles, in which there were always monks, abbots, and biſhops, periſhing with ſword in hand. Hugh, one of the ſons of Charlemagne, who had formerly been forced to embrace a monaſtic life, and afterwards came to be abbot of St. Quintin, was killed before Toulouſe, toge-

ther with the abbot of Farriere; and, at the ſame time and place, two biſhops were made priſoners.

Theſe civil broils ceaſed for a while, but it was only to return again with redoubled fury. The three brothers, Lotharius, Charles, and Lewis, made a freſh diviſion of the empire between them, which did but prove a ſubject of freſh animoſities and wars.

The emperor Lotharius, after having thrown all Europe into confuſion, without acquiring either ſucceſs or glory, finding himſelf growing weak and feeble, turned monk, and retired to the abbey of Prum. He lived however but ſix days in his new ſtate, and died a fool, after having lived a tyrant.

After the death of this third emperor of the Weſt, there ſtarted up new kingdoms in Europe, like heaps of earth after the ſhock of a mighty earthquake.

Another Lotharius, ſon to the deceaſed emperor, gave the name of Lotharingia to a pretty large tract of country called ſince, by contraction, Lorrain: lying between the Rhine, the Scheld, the Maeſe, and the ſea: what we now call Brabant, was then called Upper Lorrain, and the reſt Lower Lorrain. At preſent there is no more remaining of Upper Lorrain than a ſmall province of that name, lately ſwallowed up in the kingdom of France.

A ſecond ſon of the emperor Lotharius, named Charles, had Savoy, Dauphiné, and a part of Lyonnois, Provence, and Languedoc. This ſtate compoſed the kingdom of Arles, ſo called from the name of its capital, which had formerly been an opulent city, and greatly embelliſhed by the Romans; but now a poor, petty, inſignificant place, as indeed are all the towns on this ſide the Alps.

A barbarian, by ſome writers called Solomon *, ſoon after made himſelf king of Brittany, a part of which ſtill

* This Solomon became duke of Bretagne by the death of his kinſman Harupogus, whom he treacherouſly murdered with his own hand, although he had taken refuge at the altar. He aſſiſted Charles the Bald in his wars with the Normans, and in recompence this prince honoured him with the enſigns of royalty: but he was dethroned by his own ſubjects, and in his turn aſſaſſinated at the altar.

ſtill continued in paganiſm; but all theſe petty kingdoms ſunk almoſt as quickly as they were raiſed.

The ſhadow of the Roman empire ſtill ſubſiſted. Lewis, the ſecond ſon of Lotharius, who had a part of Italy for his ſhare, was proclaimed emperor by Pope Sergius II. in 855. He did not reſide at Rome, nor did he poſſeſs the ninth part of Charlemagne's empire, having only an authority in Italy, and that conteſted by the popes and the dukes of Benevento, who were then in poſſeſſion of a conſiderable tract of dominion.

By his death, which happened in 875, if the Salique law had had any degree of weight, with reſpect to the family of Charlemagne, the empire of right devolved to the elder branch of that houſe; and Lewis of Bavaria, as ſuch, ought to have ſucceeded his nephew on his dying without children. But arms and money determined the right to Charles the Bald, who ſhut up the paſſages of the Alps againſt his brother, and haſtened to Rome with a body of troops. Reginus, and the annals of Metz, and Fulden tell us for certain, that he purchaſed the empire of pope John VIII. who not only made him pay handſomely for it, but, profiting of ſo favourable a conjuncture, for raiſing the authority of his ſee, gave the empire as a ſovereign, and Charles received it as a vaſſal; declaring that he held it of the Pope, in like manner as he had before declared in France, in 859, that he ought to ſubmit to the deciſion of the biſhops; but he did not care how much he debaſed his dignity, provided he could but enjoy it.

Under him then the Roman empire was compoſed of France and Italy. It is ſaid that he died poiſoned by his own phyſician, who was a Jew, by name Sedecias; but no one has ever pretended to ſay for what reaſon he committed this crime. What could this phyſician gain by poiſoning his maſter? Under whom could he enjoy a more happy lot? No writer makes mention of the puniſhment inflicted on him; and therefore we have a right to doubt the truth of this poiſoning ſtory, and content ourſelves with reflecting on the ignorance of Chriſtendom at that time, when kings were obliged to ſend in ſearch of phyſicians amongſt the Jews and Arabs.

This ſhadow of an empire ſtill continued to be a bone of contention; Lewis the Stammerer, king of France, the ſon of Charles the Bald, diſputed the poſſeſſion of it with the other deſcendants of Charlemagne: but all the parties aſked it of the Pope. A duke of Spoleto, and a marquis of Tuſcany, who had been inveſted with theſe ſtates by Charles the Bald, ſeized on the perſon of pope John VIII. and plundered a part of Rome, in order, as they ſaid, to oblige that pontiff to confer the imperial dignity on a king of Bavaria, named Carloman, the eldeſt of the deſcendants of Charlemagne. And this pope John had not only theſe perſecutions to ſuffer in Rome from Italians, but had juſt before, in 877, been obliged to pay the ſum of twenty-five thouſand pounds weight of ſilver to the Mahometans, who were poſſeſſors of the iſland of Sicily, and the Neapolitan coaſt. This was the money which Charles the Bald had given him for the empire; but it ſoon paſſed from the hands of the Pope into thoſe of the Saracens; and the former was even obliged to agree, by an authentic treaty, to pay them the like ſum annually.

However, this pontiff, who was a tributary to the Mahometans, and a priſoner in Rome, made his eſcape, took ſhipping, and got over to France; where he performed the office of conſecrating the emperor Lewis the Stammerer, in the city of Troyes, after the example of his predeceſſors Leo III. Alexander, and Stephen III. who, though perſecuted and driven from their own dominions, ſtill continued to diſpoſe of the crowns of other kingdoms.

Under the reign of Charles the Fat *, emperor and king of France, the deſolations of Europe were redoubled. The farther the blood of Charlemagne ran from its ſource the more it degenerated. Charles the
877 Fat was declared incapable of reigning, by an aſſembly of French and German nobles, who depoſed him in a council called by himſelf, at a place near Mentz. This was not the act of a ſet of biſhops, who,

* For what reaſon our author has omitted mentioning Lewis III. we are at a loſs to comprehend. His reign indeed was ſhort but not inglorious.

who, while they are baſely ſerving the ambition or revenge of a prince, affect to diſpoſe of crowns; this was an aſſembly of the principal nobility, who thought they had a right to make choice of the perſon who was to govern them, and under whoſe command they were to fight. It is ſaid that Charles the Fat grew weak in his intellects; weak he always was, without doubt, ſince, by his conduct, he had brought himſelf to ſuch a paſs, as to ſuffer himſelf to be dethroned without offering to make the leaſt reſiſtance, and to loſe, at one ſtroke, all Germany, France, and Italy, and be reduced, at length, to depend upon the charity of the archbiſhop of Mentz, for the common neceſſaries of life. It is evident, that in theſe times the natural order of ſucceſſion was reckoned as nothing, ſince Arnold, the baſtard of Carloman, ſon to Lewis the Stammerer, was declared emperor, and Eudes, or Odo, count of Paris, made king of France. There was then neither the right of birth, nor the acknowledged right of election. Europe was a chaos*, in which the ſtrongeſt roſe upon the ruins of the weakeſt, to be again tumbled down, in their turns, by others.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the NORMANS towards the Ninth Century.

EUROPE was now all confuſion: every thing was divided, every thing weak and miſerable. This opened a paſſage to the people of Scandinavia, and thoſe who inhabited the ports of the Baltic Sea. Theſe ſavages, grown too numerous for the lands they poſſeſſed, lands in themſelves barren and ungrateful to the labourer's toil; without any manufactures of their own, and deſtitute of all knowledge of the arts, ſought only how to ſpread themſelves at a diſtance from their own country. Robbery and piracy were as neceſſary to them, as carnage to beaſts of prey. The Germans called theſe people by the general name of Normans, or men of the

* Still excepting England, which at that period enjoyed uninterrupted felicity under the rule of the incomparable Alfred.

North, in the ſame manner as we ſtill ſay in general, the corſairs of Barbary, or the Salee rovers. As early as the fourth century they mingled in the fleets of other barbarians, and aſſiſted in carrying deſolation even into Rome and Africa: we have already ſeen that, during the reign of Charlemagne, they kept at home for fear of ſlavery. In the time of Lewis the Debonnaire they began to cruize abroad. The vaſt foreſts with which their country was overſpread, furniſhed them with ſufficient quantities of timber for building their veſſels, which were worked with two ſails and with oars, and would contain about an hundred men, with all the neceſſary proviſions for a cruize. They uſed to coaſt along the ſea-ſhore, and make deſcents in thoſe places where they were likely to meet with no reſiſtance, and afterwards returned home with what booty they could pick up, of which they made a regular diſtribution, according to the laws of piracy, as is now done among the pirates on the coaſt of Barbary. As early as the year 843, we find them entering France by the mouth of the river Seine, and plundering the city of Rouen; another fleet made its way by the river Loire, and laid all the country waſte as far as Touraine. The men they took in theſe cruizes they kept in ſlavery; the women and girls they divided among themſelves. They even brought away the young children, in order to train them up to the buſineſs of piracy: wherever they landed they cleared all before them, bringing away cattle, moveables, and every thing that came in their way; and would ſometimes ſell upon one coaſt what they had brought off from another. The ſucceſs of their firſt expeditions excited the avarice of their indigent countrymen. The inhabitants of the ſea-coaſt of Germany ſoon joined them, and entered on board their veſſels in like manner as the renegadoes of Provence and Sicily have ſerved in the fleets of Algiers.

In the year 844, they covered the ſea with their ſhips, and made deſcents almoſt at the ſame time in England, France, and Spain. There were no meaſures taken, indeed, either by the French or Engliſh, to prevent theſe

theſe invaſions; but in Spain the ſea-coaſts were guarded by the Arabs *, who, at length, drove theſe pirates off.

In 845, the Normans plundered the town of Hamburgh, and penetrated a conſiderable way into Germany. They were no longer, as at their firſt ſetting out, a confuſed rabble of pirates without order: they had now a fleet of ſix hundred barks, containing a very formidable army, and commanded by a king of Denmark, whoſe name was Eric, under whom they gained two conſiderable battles before they reimbarked. This piratical prince, after returning home loaded with German ſpoils, ſent one of the admirals of the corſairs, whom hiſtorians call Regnier, on an expedition againſt France: this man ſailed up the river Seine with a fleet of a hundred and twenty ſail. We can hardly ſuppoſe that theſe hundred and twenty ſail could carry twenty thouſand men; and yet, with a number probably inferior, he plundered the city of Rouen for the ſecond time, and even advanced as far as Paris. In theſe kinds of invaſions, where the weakneſs of the government has not provided againſt ſuch ſurprizes, the apprehenſion of the people always augments the danger, and the greater number frequently flies before the leſſer. This was preciſely the caſe on the preſent occaſion; the Pariſians, who, at other times, had

* Our author ſeems to be particularly attached to the Mahometans, eſpecially the Arabs, whom he on all occaſions compliments at the expence of the European Chriſtians. The government of France, it muſt be owned, was weak under Charles the Bald; but, at this period, the Engliſh had a vigorous adminiſtration, a ſpirited prince, and an eſtabliſhed militia. In the year 833, the Danes, even though joined by a ſtrong body of Britons, were routed with great ſlaughter by king Egbert, who united the Heptarchy. They were, in the ſequel, as often engaged as they preſumed to land. In the year 851, they were defeated at Wenebury by the militia under count Ceorl. King Athelſtan, having equipped a fleet, obtained a victory over them on their own element; and in the year 853, they were totally routed at Okeley in Surry. In ſuch an extended coaſt as that of Great Britain, it is ſimply impoſſible for any government to take ſuch precautions as will totally prevent the ſudden deſcents of ſuch pirates: beſides, they were encouraged by their countrymen ſettled in Northumberland, and often joined by the Britons of Wales and Cornwal.

been wont to defend themſelves with ſo much bravery, now abandoned their city to the enemy, who found nothing there but wooden houſes which they burnt to the ground. The unfortunate king, Charles, the Bald, who had entrenched himſelf at St. Denis with a few troops, inſtead of making head againſt theſe barbarians, purchaſed their retreat for the ſum of fourteen thouſand marks of ſilver. It is provoking to read in ſome of our authors, that many of theſe barbarians were ſtruck dead for having pillaged the church of St. Germain-des-prez. Neither the people nor their ſaints made the leaſt defence, and yet muſt the conquered indulge themſelves in the pitiful ſatisfaction of imaginary miracles wrought againſt their victors.

Charles the Bald, in thus purchaſing a peace of theſe pirates, only furniſhed them with freſh means of carrying on the war, and deprived himſelf of that of ſupporting it. The Normans employed the money they had gotten from Charles in carrying on the ſiege of Bourdeaux, which they took and pillaged; and, to complete the general horror and humiliation, Pepin, king of Aquitain, a deſcendant of Charlemagne, finding himſelf unable to make head againſt theſe barbarians, joined them; and then (about 858) France was totally ravaged. The Normans having conſiderably encreaſed in ſtrength by the ſeveral parties who had joined them, continued for a long time to ſpread deſolation through Germany, Flanders, and the Engliſh coaſt. We have lately ſeen armies of one hundred thouſand men ſcarcely able, even after ſignal victories, to take two towns; to ſuch a perfection has the art of fortifying and preparing places againſt an attack, been carried in our times; but in thoſe days, a band of barbarians fighting againſt other barbarians at variance with each other, found nothing to oppoſe their incurſions after ſucceeding in the firſt blow. Sometimes indeed they might be defeated, but then it was only to return with additional force. Godfrey, king of Denmark, to whom Charles the Fat had ceded a part of Holland in the year 882, penetrated from thence into Flanders, when his Normans paſſed from the Somme to the Oiſe without meeting with any

reſiſtance,

reſiſtance, and took and burnt Pontoiſe; after which they came before Paris by land and water.

The Pariſians, who then expected an irruption of barbarians, did not abandon their city as be- 885
fore. Odo, or Eudes, count of Paris, whoſe valour afterwards raiſed him to the throne of France, put the city into ſuch good order, and made ſuch excellent regulations as animated the courage of the inhabitants, and ſerved them inſtead of towers and ramparts. Sigefroy, who commanded the Normans in this expedition, puſhed the ſiege with the moſt obſtinate fury, but yet not deſtitute of art. He taught his people to uſe battering-rams for making a breach in the walls, which they at length effected, and then gave three general aſſaults, which the inhabitants ſtood with incredible bravery. The Pariſians were not headed by count Eudes only, but by their biſhop Goſlin likewiſe, who every day, after giving his benediction to the people, mounted the breach in perſon, and, with a helmet on his head, a quiver of arrows at his back, and an ax at his girdle, after having planted a croſs on the ramparts, fought with it in his view. This prelate ſeems to have had at leaſt as much authority in the city as the count himſelf; for when Sigefroy endeavoured to obtain permiſſion to enter Paris, Goſlin was the perſon to whom he addreſſed himſelf. This good biſhop died with fatigue in the midſt of the ſiege, leaving behind him a valued and reſpected memory; for though he armed thoſe hands which religion reſerves wholly for the ſervice of the altar, yet it was for the ſafety of that altar, and of his fellow-citizens, fighting in the moſt juſt of all cauſes, and a neceſſary defence, which is ever above the laws. His brethren had only armed themſelves in civil wars, and againſt Chriſtians: and perhaps if an apotheoſis is due to any man, this prelate, who died fighting for his country, had a much better title to heaven than ſo many obſcure people, whoſe virtues, if they had any, were of little or no real ſervice to the world.

The Normans continued to beſiege the city for a year and a half; during which time the inhabitants ſuffered, with the utmoſt reſolution, all the horrors of famine and contagion,

contagion, the general concomitants of long ſieges. At length the emperor Charles the Fat, king of France, appeared upon the mount of Mars, ſince called Montmartre, with a body of forces which he had brought to their relief; but he was afraid to attack the Normans, and only came to purchaſe a ſecond ſhameful truce. The barbarians raiſed the ſiege of Paris, to inveſt the city of Sens, and pillage Burgundy, while Charles went to Mentz, and called a parliament, which deprived him of a throne he was ſo unworthy to poſſeſs.

The Normans ſtill continued their devaſtations; but, tho' enemies to the name of Chriſtian, it never once entered into their thoughts to oblige any one to renounce Chriſtianity. They were nearly the ſame kind of people as the Franks, the Goths, the Alans, the Huns, and the Heruli, who, when in ſearch of new ſettlements about the fourth century, were ſo far from impoſing a new religion upon the Romans, that they very readily accommodated themſelves to theirs: in like manner the Turks, at the time they ravaged the empire of the caliphs, conformed to the mahometan religion.

At length Rollo, or Raoul, the moſt illuſtrious of theſe northern banditti, being driven out of Denmark, aſſembled in Scandinavia all thoſe who were willing to follow his fortunes: with theſe he went in ſearch of new adventures, founding his hopes of future greatneſs on the weak and indefenſible ſtate in which he knew Europe to be at that time. He landed firſt in England, where his countrymen were already eſtabliſhed: but after two fruitleſs victories, he turned his views towards France, which others of the Norman race had found the means to ruin, but had not been able to enſlave.

Rollo was the only one of theſe barbarians who ceaſed to deſerve that name, by ſeeking for a ſettled habitation. Having made himſelf maſter of Rouen with very little trouble, inſtead of deſtroying it, he ordered the towers and walls to be rebuilt, and made it his arſenal, from whence he made excurſions at different times into England and France, always making war with as much policy as fury. France was at her laſt gaſp under the reign of Charles the Simple, who had indeed the name

name of king, but had his monarchy more rent and divided by the dukes, counts, and barons, his ſubjects, than even by the Normans themſelves. Charles the Fat had given only money to the barbarians, Charles the Simple offered Rollo his daughter, and with her a part of his provinces.

Rollo at firſt demanded Normandy, which Charles thought himſelf very happy to give him. 912 After this he inſiſted upon Brittany, but here he met with a refuſal; however, in the end, Charles was obliged to comply with his demands, and yield him that province, and with ſuch clauſes too, as the ſtrongeſt generally explains to his own advantage. Thus Brittany, which a little before had been a kingdom, became a fief to Neuſtria; and Neuſtria, which quickly came to be called Normandy, from the name of its conquerors, became a ſeparate ſtate; whoſe dukes paid an empty homage to the crown of France.

The archbiſhop of Rouen found means to perſuade Rollo to become a Chriſtian; that prince being very ready to embrace a religion that ſecured to him his power.

Thoſe are truly conquerors who know how to make laws. Their power is fixed on a ſolid baſis, whilſt that of others paſſes away like a torrent. Rollo, now grown peaceable, was the only law-giver of his time on the Chriſtian continent. It is well known with what inflexibility he adminiſtered juſtice: he aboliſhed theft among his Danes, who till then had lived only by rapine. For a long time after his death, the very mentioning his name was a ſufficient order to the officers of juſtice to run and ſuppreſs any act of violence; from hence came the cuſtom, well known in Normandy, of crying *Haro*. The Danes and Franks mingling together, produced thoſe heroes whom we ſhall ſee conquering England, Naples, and Sicily.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Of ENGLAND, towards the Ninth Century.

THE Engliſh, now ſo powerful and famous, throughout the world, both for war and commerce, who are governed by the love of their own laws, and that ſpirit of freedom which conſiſts in obeying the laws only, were a very different people then to what they are at preſent.

They had lately ſhaken off the Norman yoke; but it was only to fall under that of the Saxons, who having conquered England about the ſixth century, were themſelves conquered in the eighth by Charlemagne. Theſe uſurpers divided the country into ſeven cantons,
828 which they called kingdoms; theſe ſeven provinces were afterwards united under king Egbert of the Saxon race, when the Normans came to ravage England as well as France. It is ſaid, that in 852, theſe pirates ſailed up the Thames with a fleet of three hundred ſail. The Engliſh defended themſelves no better than their neighbours the Franks had done: like them they bought off their conquerors; and one of their kings, named Ethelbert †, following the unhappy example of Charles the Bald, gave them money. The ſame fault met with the ſame puniſhment. The pirates made uſe of this very money to conquer the country more effectually; in ſhort, they over-run the better half of the iſland. Certainly the Engliſh, who are by nature brave, and are ſo well defended by their ſituation, muſt have ſome very eſſential defects in their government, ſince we find them always ſubdued by people, who ſhould not ſeemingly have invaded them with impunity. The relations of the dreadful ravages that laid this

† It is very ſtrange that the hiſtorian ſhould introduce Ethelbert as paying tribute to the Danes in the year 852, whereas that prince did not aſcend the throne of England till above a whole century after this period.

this wretched iſland waſte, ſtill ſurpaſs thoſe we have already ſeen in France. There are certain periods in which the whole globe is but one ſcene of ſlaughter, and theſe periods are but too frequent.

It muſt certainly be pleaſing to the reader to breathe a little after ſuch a ſcene of horrors, and to behold ſome great man ariſe, to reſcue his bleeding country from ſlavery, and govern her like a good king.

I do not think that there ever was in the world a man more worthy of the regard of poſterity than Alfred the Great, who did all this for his country, ſuppoſing what is related of him to be true.

This prince ſucceeded his brother Ethelred I. who left him only a conteſted right to the crown, and a kingdom more than ever divided into petty ſovereignties, moſt of them occupied by Deans. Almoſt every year produced a ſucceſſion of new pirates, who came to invade the coaſts, and diſpute with the firſt uſurpers the little that was left of their former depredations. 872

Alfred, who was maſter only of a ſingle province in the Weſt, was ſoon vanquiſhed by theſe barbarians, in a pitched battle *, and deſerted by every body: yet he did not follow the example of his uncle Butred, who, when driven by the Danes from a ſmall province of which he was king, retired to the Engliſh college at Rome: on the contrary, though alone and unaſſiſted, he reſolved to periſh, or revenge the wrongs of his country. He concealed himſelf for ſix months in a ſhepherd's cottage in the middle of a moraſs, without imparting the ſecret to any one but the earl of Devon, who ſtill continued to defend a weak fortreſs againſt the barbarians.

After

* Alfred, far from being vanquiſhed in the beginning, compelled the Danes in the very firſt month of his reign, to evacuate his dominions; and next year he obliged them to ſue for peace. In the year 876 he defeated and deſtroyed their whole armada, conſiſting of one hundred and twenty ſhips. It was after this period that he was ſuddenly overwhelmed by a torrent of freſh comers, who joined their countrymen, that had been for ſome time in poſſeſſion of Northumberland, Eaſt-Anglia, and Mercia; and poured in like a torrent upon his unguarded country.

After ſome time this nobleman, having gathered together a body of forces, gained a ſmall advantage over the enemy. At this juncture Alfred, cloathed in a ſhepherd's tatter'd dreſs, ventured into the Daniſh camp as a player on the harp, where, after being eye-witneſs of the ſituation and defects of the camp, and having learnt that the barbarians were ſoon to celebrate a grand feſtival, he flew to inform the earl of Devon of it, who had ſome troops in readineſs, and marching back to the Danes with this ſmall but reſolute army, he ſurprized them in the midſt of their merriment, and gained a complete victory. The Danes were at that time divided by inteſtine factions; and Alfred, who was no leſs able a negotiator than a courageous warrior, was, to the general ſurprize, unanimouſly choſen king by the Danes and Engliſh. London was now the only place that remained to be conquered, which he took, fortified, and embelliſhed: he then fitted out fleets, kept the Engliſh Danes in ſubjection, and guarded his ſea-coaſts againſt foreign invaſion; and finally employed himſelf, during a peaceable reign of twelve years, in improving and poliſhing his country. His laws were mild, but ſtrictly enforced. He was the firſt who ſettled juries, and divided England into ſhires and counties, and encouraged the ſpirit of commerce among his ſubjects. We are told that he lent ſhips and money to certain learned and enterprizing men, who made a voyage as far as Alexandria; and from thence paſſing the iſthmus of Suez, traded in the Perſian Gulph. He eſtabliſhed militias, erected ſeveral councils, and introduced that regularity throughout his kingdom, which is the never-failing ſource of peace and plenty.

It appears to me, that there never was a truly great man, who was not at the ſame time a perſon of good underſtanding. Alfred founded the univerſity of Oxford, and ſent for books from Rome, England being at that time ſo barbarous as not to have any of its own; nay, it is ſaid that he even complained that he had not one prieſt in all his kingdom who underſtood Latin; as for himſelf he was a perfect maſter of it, and was at the ſame time a tolerable mathematician for the age he lived in: he

he had likewiſe a competent knowledge of hiſtory, and ſome writers pretend that he wrote poems in the Anglo-Saxon tongue. All the time he had to ſpare from public occupations were dedicated to ſtudy. By a prudent œconomy he had it in his power to be liberal; for we find that he built ſeveral churches, but not one monaſtery *, being doubtleſs of opinion, that in a depopulated ſtate which wanted recruiting, it would have been but ill ſerving his country to countenance thoſe numerous families, which, without parents or children, perpetuate themſelves at the expence of the nation: for this reaſon it is, in all probability, that we do not find his name in the catalogue of ſaints; but hiſtory, that reproaches him neither with crimes nor weakneſs, places him in the firſt rank of thoſe heroes who have been of ſervice to mankind, who, without ſuch extraordinary perſonages, would ſtill have remained in a ſtate little better than that of ſavage beaſts.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of SPAIN, and the Muſſulmans towards the Eighth and Ninth Centuries.

WHEN I turn my eyes towards Spain, I behold misfortunes and revolutions of another kind, which merit our particular attention. Let us then in a few words trace matters back to their ſource, and recal to our remembrance that the Goths, who uſurped this kingdom, and became outwardly Chriſtians, though ſtill as much Barbarians as before, were expelled from hence about the eighth century by the Muſſulmans of Africa. I am of opinion that the imbecility of king Wamba

* It is expreſsly ſaid by Aſſerius in his life of Alfred, that he rebuilt monaſteries and churches.

Wamba *, who on that account was ſhut up in a monaſtery, was the original cauſe of the downfal of this kingdom. To his weakneſs was owing the ravages committed by his ſucceſſors. Witiza, a prince ſtill more ſenſeleſs than Wamba, as he added cruelty to his other follies, cauſed his ſubjects, whom he feared, to be diſarmed †, and in ſo doing deprived himſelf of the benefit of their aſſiſtance.

Roderiguez, or Roderic, whoſe father this Witiza had aſſaſſinated, murdered him in his turn, and proved ſtill more wicked than himſelf. We need not therefore look any farther for the cauſe of the ſuperiority gained by the Muſſulmans in Spain. I cannot ſay whether it is true that Roderic raviſhed Florinda, called La Cava, or the wicked, the unhappily famous daughter of count Julian; who upon this account called in the Moors to aſſiſt him in revenging the honour of his family. Perhaps the adventure of Cava is partly copied from that of Lucretia: and indeed neither the one nor the other of theſe ſtories ſeem founded on very authentic proofs. In my opinion there wanted not the pretext of a rape, which is commonly as difficult to prove as to commit ‡, for

* Wamba was one of the moſt glorious of the Viſigoth kings, whether we conſider him as a conqueror or legiſlator. His imbecility was no more than the temporary effect of a ſtupifying doſe, adminiſtered by Erviga, during which he was ſhaven and put into the habit of a penitent; he ſoon recovered the uſe of his ſenſes, and had power and courage ſufficient to have puniſhed the treacherous Erviga; but being far advanced in years, and having no children, he choſe to finiſh his days in a convent, rather than involve his country in the miſeries of a civil war.

† So indeed we are told by ſome Spaniſh hiſtorians, ſuch as Alphonſ. Mag. Chron. Luc. Tudens, and Roderic Toletan, who likewiſe add that he diſmantled every town in his dominions except three; but the firſt allegation is improbable, and the laſt untrue; for the Moors found many other cities in Spain well fortified, and obſtinately defended.

‡ Difficult indeed in a court of juſtice, but not in the breaſt of a father, a Spaniard, a nobleman, proud, jealous, and vindictive.—There is nothing at all improbable in the ſtory of Cava's being raviſhed by Roderig; or, according to ſome authors, by his predeceſſor Witiza, and that her father was exaſperated into treachery and

for calling in the Africans: for before that, in the reign of king Wamba, count Herwig, who was afterwards king himſelf, had brought over an army of Moors. Opas, archbiſhop of Seville, who was the principal inſtrument in this great revolution, had intereſts of a deeper concern to ſupport than that of a lady's honour. This prelate, who was ſon to the uſurper Witiza, who had been dethroned and murdered by the uſurper Roderic, was the perſon whoſe ambition occaſioned the calling in of the Moors this ſecond time. Count Julian found ſufficient reaſon, as being ſon-in-law to Witiza, to take up arms againſt the reigning tyrant, and a biſhop named Toriza joined in the conſpiracy with the count and the archbiſhop Opas. Is it likely then that two biſhops ſhould have thus truſted themſelves with the enemies of the chriſtian name, merely on account of a woman?

But be that as it will, the Mahometans were the maſters, as they are to this day, of all that part of Africa which had formerly belonged to the Romans, and had but a little time before founded the city of Morocco, near mount Atlas. The caliph Valid Almanzor, who was ſovereign of that delightful part of the world, had his reſidence at Damaſcus, in Syria. His viceroy, Muzza, who at that time was governor of Africa, made the entire conqueſt of all Spain, by one of his lieutenants. Immediately after which he ſent his general, Tarif, over thither, who in 714 gained that famous battle in which the tyrant Roderic loſt his life. Some ſay that the Saracens did not obſerve their engagements with count Julian, whom they doubtleſs miſtruſted: but archbiſhop Opas was better ſatisfied with them, and ſwore fidelity to the Mahometan government, under which he continued to preſerve a conſiderable authority over the chriſtian

and rebellion by this injury. It is not, however, mentioned by the more antient hiſtorians, Iſador of Badajoz, Alphonſo the Great, or the author of the Chronicle of the Alreyda. The truth is, the Moors had long endeavoured to ſubdue Spain, and as they were more powerful at ſea than the Spaniards, it was impoſſible to prevent their landing.

chriſtian churches, which were tolerated by the conquerors.

As to king Roderic, he was ſo little regretted, that his widow Egilona publicly eſpouſed young Abdalis, ſon to the conqueror Muzza, by whoſe arms her former huſband had fallen, and who had reduced her country and religion to a ſtate of ſlavery.

In the ſpace of fourteen months all Spain was brought under the ſubjection of the empire of the caliphs, excepting a few ſcarcely habitable rocks and caverns in the kingdom of Aſturias, where * Pelagius Teudomer, the Goth, a relation of the late king Roderic, had concealed himſelf, and thus preſerved his liberty. I cannot conceive why authors have given the title of king to this prince, though indeed worthy of it, ſince the whole of his royalty conſiſted in not being a ſlave. The Spaniſh hiſtorians, and thoſe, who have followed their accounts, have made him gain ſeveral great victories, fancied miracles in his favour, have ſettled him a court, and given him his ſon Favilla, and ſon-in-law Alphonſo, as peaceable ſucceſſors of this pretended kingdom. But how can it be ſuppoſed that the Mahometans, who under Abderames, in the year 734, had ſubdued one half of France, ſhould have ſuffered this kingdom of Aſturias to have ſubſiſted quietly on the other ſide of the Pyrennees? It was a great point for the Chriſtians to be ſuffered to retire to theſe mountains, and live upon what they could get

* According to all the Spaniſh hiſtorians, except Pellecier, Pelagius or Pelago and Theodomer, were too perſons. Our author cannot conceive that the Moors in the zenith of their power would allow any independent dynaſty to ſubſiſt in Spain: but this objection will, we apprehend, vaniſh entirely, when we conſider that the government of Don Pelago was founded in the little province of Liebana, ſurrounded by inacceſſible mountains, and indeed not worth the trouble of ſubduing: beſides, it appears that as ſoon as Pelago began to extend his territories, he was invaded by a very numerous army of Moors, who were defeated in the year 719, among the mountains of St. Mavia de Cavadonga: our author is therefore miſtaken in ſaying the Chriſtians were not able to make head againſt the Moors till the year 759, when they were weakened by the victories of Charles Martel, and their own inteſtine diviſions.

get for paying a tribute to theſe Infidels; nor was it till about the year 759 that they began to be able to make head againſt their conquerors, weakened by the many defeats they had ſuſtained from the arms of Charles Martel, and their own inteſtine diviſions: but the Chriſtians, ſtill more divided among themſelves than the Mahometans, ſoon relapſed under the former yoke. Mauregato, to whom hiſtorians have been pleaſed to give the title of king, had leave granted him to govern the Aſturias and ſome other neighbouring territories, on paying homage and tribute to the Mahometans; and he even ſubmitted to furniſh one hundred beautiful young women every year for Abderames' ſeraglio *. It had been for a long time a cuſtom among the Arabs to exact ſuch kind of tributes from their vaſſals; and to this day the caravans, among the preſents which they make to the wild Arabs, always give a certain number of marriageable young women. 783

Hiſtorians tell us of a deacon named Veremond, who ſucceeded this Mauregato, and was chief of theſe mountain refugees, yielded the ſame homage, and paid the ſame tribute of handſome women. But is this a kingdom, or can ſuch as theſe be called kings †?

After the death of this Abderames, the emirs or governors of the Spaniſh provinces aſpired to independency. We have already ſeen, under the article of Charlemagne, that one of them, named Ibna Larabi, had the imprudence to call that conqueror in to his aſſiſtance. Now if there had really been any chriſtian kingdoms exiſting at that time in Spain, would not Charles have taken ſuch kingdoms under his protection, preferably to

* This is a mere fable, rejected by the beſt hiſtorians. Mauregato was an uſurper, who ſupported his uſurpation by engaging in a cloſe alliance with the Mirammolin; but we have no reaſon to believe he was his tributary.

† This prince's name was Barmudo. Without all doubt theſe were kings, and glorious kings too, howſoever their conduct and valour may have diſobliged our author, M. de Voltaire, who lets ſlip no opportunity of expreſſing his regard and admiration of the Arabs, than whom, notwithſtanding all he can alledge in their favour, there never was a more perfidious, cruel, and barbarous people on the face of the earth.

to joining his arms with Mahometans? However, he took this emir under his protection, obliging him to do him homage for the dominions lying between the Ebro and the Pyrennees, which the Mahometans then poſſeſſed. We find that in 794 the Moor Abutar did homage to Lewis the Debonnaire, who at that time governed Aquitain under his father, with the title of king.

Some time afterwards the diviſions among the Spaniſh Moors began to encreaſe, which the council of Lewis the Debonnaire turned to their own diſadvantage; for they laid ſiege to Barcelona, which they kept inveſted for two years, and at length Lewis entered it in triumph in the year 796. This was the beginning of the decline of the Mooriſh empire. Theſe conquerors were no longer ſupported by the aſſiſtance of the Africans and the caliphs, whoſe yokes they had thrown off. The ſucceſſors of Abderames having fixed the ſeat of their kingdom at Cordova, were but ill obeyed by the governors of the more diſtant provinces.

At this favourable period it was that Alphonſo, of the race of Pelagius, began to render the Spaniſh Chriſtians who had retired into the mountains of Aſturias, conſiderable. He refuſed to pay the cuſtomary tributes to maſters whom he knew himſelf in a condition to diſpute it with; and after having gained ſome few victories over them, he found himſelf in the quiet poſſeſſion of the kingdoms of Aſturias and Leon, at the beginning of the ninth century.

With this prince then we muſt firſt look for the revival of chriſtian kings in Spain. Alphonſo was artful and cruel: he is called the Chaſte, becauſe he was the firſt who refuſed to pay the tribute of the hundred damſels to the Moors. But without reflecting at the ſame time that it was not on account of refuſing this tribute that he incurred the war, but becauſe that, being determined to ſhake off all ſubmiſſion to the Moors, and be no longer tributary to them, he muſt have refuſed the tribute of the virgins as well as every other kind of homage.

The ſucceſs Alphonſo had met with, in ſpite of the many obſtacles he had to encounter, emboldened the Chriſtians of Navarre to chuſe themſelves a king. The inhabitants

inhabitants of Arragon took up arms under one of their counts: thus, towards the latter end of the reign of Lewis the Debonnaire, neither the Moors nor the French retained any poſſeſſions in thoſe barren countries; but the reſt of Spain ſtill continued under the dominion of the Muſſulman kings. It was at this time that the Normans ravaged the coaſts of Spain; but being quickly repulſed, they returned back, and plundered France and England.

We muſt not wonder to find the Spaniards of Aſturias, Leon, and Arragon, at that time barbarians. The military life, which ſucceeded their former ſervitude, had by no means civilized them; and they were in a ſtate of ſuch profound ignorance, that one of the Alphonſo's, ſurnamed the Great, who was king of Leon and Aſturias, was obliged to have Mahometan maſters for his ſon.

I cannot get over my aſtoniſhment at ſeeing hiſtorians ſo laviſh of their titles to the kings of thoſe times. This Alphonſo, whom they ſtile the Great, put out the eyes of four of his brothers: and his whole life was one continued ſeries of cruelties and deceit †. This king finiſhed his career with making his ſubjects take arms againſt him, and was obliged to reſign his ſmall kingdom to his ſon in the year 910.

While theſe things were tranſacting, and the Mahometans loſt that part of Spain which borders upon France, they were extending their dominions on every other ſide. If I conſider their religion, I find it embraced

† Mariana indeed ſays, that Froila, Nugnez, Veremond, and Odouir, were the brothers of Alphonſo. But this aſſertion is refuted by the monk of Silos, a cotemporary hiſtorian, who expreſsly affirms that Don Alphonſo was the only ſon of Don Ordogno. Be that as it may, thoſe four noblemen were taken in an actual and unprovoked rebellion, after the king had generouſly forgiven the ringleaders of ſeveral inſurrections. He is indeed extolled for his clemency by the beſt Spaniſh hiſtorians, who characterize him as an excellent prince, wiſe, valiant, unaffectedly pious, mercifully liberal, a patron of learning, himſelf ſo learned that he compoſed a chronicle, beginning at the death of Receſuintho, and ending with his own father. Of his cruelties we know none, unleſs we give that name to the blood which was neceſſarily ſhed in the courſe of a long war againſt the Moors, the favourites of our author, over whom Alphonſo obtained a great number of glorious victories.

braced all over India, and the eaſtern parts of Africa, where they traded. If I view their conqueſts, I find, in the firſt place, that the caliph Aaron Rachild (or Haroun Alraſched) impoſed a yearly tribute of ten thouſand crowns of gold, on the empreſs Irene; and that on the emperor Nicephorus refuſing to pay this tribute, Aaron ſeized upon the iſland of Cyprus, and proceeded to ravage all Greece. In 826 the lieutenants of his grand-ſon Almamon, a prince otherwiſe eſtimable for his own learning, and the love he bore the ſciences, ſeized on Crete. At this time the city of Candia was built by the Mahometans, who have made themſelves maſters of it again in our time.

In 828 theſe ſame Africans, who had ſubdued Spain and made incurſions into Sicily, returned again to lay waſte that fruitful iſland, being encouraged thereto by one of the natives, named Euphemius, who having, after the example of his emperor Michael, married a nun, and been proſecuted by thoſe very laws, which the emperor had made to yield to his deſires, acted nearly the ſame part in Sicily which count Julian had done in Spain.

So badly was the eaſtern and weſtern empires governed at that time, that neither of the emperors could drive the Mahometans out of Sicily. Theſe conquerors might have become maſters of all Italy, had they only been united among themſelves; but their miſtakes were the means of ſaving Rome, as thoſe of the Carthaginians had been heretofore. They ſet ſail from Sicily in 846, with a numerous fleet, and ſailing up the mouth of the Tiber, where they met with nothing but a deſert country, they proceeded to Rome, which they beſieged. They ſoon made themſelves maſters of the ſuburbs, and after plundering the rich church of St. Peter without the walls, they raiſed the ſiege, to meet and fight an army of French, which was coming to the aſſiſtance of Rome, under one of the emperor Lotharius's generals. They beat the French army, but miſſed taking the city, which had in the mean time been ſupplied with proviſions; ſo that this expedition, which ſtood ſo fair to have made a conſiderable conqueſt, through

through their own miſunderſtandings, ended in nothing more than incurſions of barbarians. However, they returned ſoon after with ſuch a formidable army, as ſeemed to threaten the total deſtruction of Italy, and to turn the capital of Chriſtendom into a Mahometan town. In this dangerous conjuncture Pope Leo IV. taking up that authority which Lotharius's generals ſeemed to have quitted, proved himſelf worthy, by defending Rome, of being its ſovereign: he employed the church-treaſures in repairing the walls, raiſing towers, and ſtretching chains acroſs the river Tiber. He armed the militia at his own expence, engaged the people of Naples and Gaieta to come to the defence of the coaſts and port of Oſtin, taking at the ſame time the prudent precaution of requiring hoſtages from them; as well knowing that thoſe who are powerful enough to defend us, are likewiſe powerful enough to hurt us. He viſited all the poſts in perſon, and received the Saracens at their landing, not in the garb of a warrior, as Goſlin, biſhop of Paris, had done on a like occaſion, but in the character of a pontiff who exhorted a chriſtian people, and a king who watched over the ſecurity of his ſubjects. He was a Roman by birth, and the courage of the firſt ages of that republic ſeemed revived in him, at a time of general cowardice and corruption, like one of thoſe noble monuments of antient Rome, which are ſometimes found amongſt the ruins of the modern: nor were his courage and care unſeconded; his people adding their efforts to his, received the invaders of their country on their landing, with the greateſt bravery; and a tempeſt having diſperſed moſt of their ſhips, a part of thoſe Barbarians who had eſcaped ſhipwreck were made ſlaves. The pope made an excellent uſe of this victory, by employing the very hands which had been armed for the deſtruction of his city, in repairing its fortifications, and beautifying the public edifices. Notwithſtanding this check, the Mahometans continued in poſſeſſion of the coaſt between Capua and Gaieta; but rather like freebooters than diſciplined conquerors.

In the ninth century then I ſee the Muſſulmans formidable both at Rome and at Conſtantinople; the

maſters of Perſia, Syria, the whole coaſt of Africa, as far as Mount Atlas, and of three-fourths of the kingdom of Spain: but without forming any nation, like the Romans, who, in extending their conqueſts as far, ſtill made but one people.

About the year 815, a little after the death of Charlemagne, and under the famous caliph Almamon, Egypt was independent, and the city of Grand Cairo was the reſidence of another caliph. The prince of Mauritania, Tin-jitana, under the title of the Mirammolin, was abſolute ſovereign of the empire of Morocco. Nubia and Lybia were under the dominion of another caliph. The race of Abderemes, who had founded the kingdom of Cordova, could not hinder other Moors from erecting that of Toledo. All theſe new dynaſties reverenced the caliph as a deſcendant from their prophet; and in like manner as the Chriſtians went in crouds on a pilgrimage to Rome, ſo did theſe Mahometans repair from all parts of the world to Mecca, which was under the government of a ſheriff, or xeriff, appointed by the caliph; and it was principally to this pilgrimage that the caliph, who was maſter of Mecca, was indebted for that reſpect and veneration paid him by all the princes of the Mahometan belief. But theſe princes, wiſely diſtinguiſhing their religion from their political intereſts, ſtript the caliph at the ſame time that they paid him homage.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Empire of CONSTANTINOPLE, in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries.

WHILE the empire of Charlemagne was thus diſmembered, and the inundations of the Saracens and Normans laid waſte the whole Weſtern Empire, that of Conſtantinople ſtill ſubſiſted, like a large tree, vigorous, tho' grown old, ſtript of ſome of its roots, and buffeted on every ſide by ſtorms and tempeſts. This empire had nothing left in Africa, and had been deſpoiled

ed of Syria and a part of Aſia Minor. It ſtill continued to defend its frontiers towards the eaſtern coaſt of the Black Sea againſt the Mahometans; and, ſometimes conquering, ſometimes conquered, it might, by being continually uſed to war, have been able at laſt to ſtrengthen itſelf againſt them: but towards the coaſt of the Danube, and the weſtern borders of the Black Sea, it was ravaged by other enemies. A nation of Scythians, called the Abari, or Avari, as alſo the Bulgarians, another tribe of Scythians, from whom the province of Bulgaria has taken its name, ſpread deſolation over all the fine country of Romania, where the emperors Adrian and Trajan formerly built ſuch beautiful villas, and thoſe noble highways, of which there are only a few cauſeways now remaining.

The Abari, particularly, ſpread themſelves over Hungary and Auſtria, falling ſometimes upon the Eaſtern empire, and at others on that of Charlemagne. Thus, from the frontiers of Perſia to that of France, the globe was a prey to almoſt continual incurſions.

While the frontier of the Greek empire was every day ſuffering encroachments and devaſtations, its capital was the theatre of revolutions and crimes. A mixture of Greek artifice and Thracian ferocity formed the reigning character of that court: and indeed what a ſpectacle does Conſtantinople exhibit to the view? the emperor Maurice and his five ſons maſſacred! Phocas aſſaſſinated, as a reward for his murders and inceſtuous proceedings! Conſtantine poiſoned by the empreſs Martina, who has her tongue pulled out, while the noſe of her ſon Heracleonas is cut off before her face! Conſtans knocked on the head in the bath by his own ſervants! Conſtantine Pogonatus putting out the eyes of his two brothers! Juſtinian II. his ſon, while about to act the ſame ſcene at Conſtantinople that Theodoſius had done at Theſſalonica, is mutilated and laid in irons by Leontius, at the inſtant that he is going to put to death the principal citizens! Leontius ſoon afterwards treated in the ſame manner as he had treated Juſtinian! this ſame Juſtinian reſtored again, and coolly looking on while the blood of his enemies waſhes the public market-

pla e, and afterwards dying himſelf by the hands of the common hangman! Philip Bardanes dethroned and condemned to loſe his eyes! Leo the Iſaurian, and Conſtantine Copronymus, dying indeed in their beds, but after a bloody reign, as unhappy for the prince as for his ſubjects! the empreſs Irene, the firſt woman who mounted the throne of the Cæſars, and the firſt too who murdered her own ſon to attain the imperial dignity! Nicephorus, her ſucceſſor, hated by his ſubjects, taken priſoner by the Bulgarians, beheaded, and thrown for food to the beaſts of the field, while his ſkull is uſed as a cup by his conqueror! laſtly, Michael Curopalatus, cotemporary with Charlemagne, confined in a cloiſter, dying a leſs cruel, though not leſs ſhameful death than his predeceſſors! In this manner was the empire governed during the ſpace of two hundred years. What hiſtory of private robbers, publicly executed for their crimes, can be more horrid or diſguſting?

But we muſt proceed, and view, in the ninth century, Leo the Armenian, a brave warrior, but an enemy to image-worſhip, aſſaſſinated at maſs, while he is ſinging an anthem: his murderers, applauding each other for having killed an heretic, repair to the public priſon to releaſe from thence an officer, ſurnamed Michael the Stammerer, who had been condemned to die by the ſenate, and, inſtead of being executed, is inveſted with the imperial purple. This was the ſame, who, falling in love with a nun, made the ſenate intreat him to marry her, without any one biſhop daring to interfere; and this fact is the more worthy of our attention, as almoſt at the ſame time we ſee Euphemius the Sicilian proſecuted for a like marriage; and that, a little time afterwards, the lawful marriage of the emperor, Leo the Philoſopher, was condemned in this very city of Conſtantinople. In what country then muſt we look for laws and manners at this time? certainly not in our weſtern hemiſphere.

The old quarrel about image-worſhip ſtill diſturbed the repoſe of the empire; the court was ſometimes for it, and ſometimes againſt it, according as they found it ſuit

ſuit with the diſpoſition of the multitude. Michael the Stammerer began his reign with the conſecration of images, and ended it by the demolition of them.

His ſucceſſor Theophilus, who reigned about twelve years, viz. from 829 to 842, declared himſelf againſt this worſhip. Writers tell us that he did not believe in the reſurrection, that he denied the exiſtence of evil ſpirits, and would not acknowledge the divinity of Chriſt. It is not unlikely that an emperor might think in this manner; but then are we to believe, I do not mean with reſpect to princes only, but even to private men, the evidence of their enemies, who, without proving one ſingle fact, vilify the religion and morals of men, who do not happen to think like themſelves?

This Theophilus, the ſon of Michael the Stammerer, was almoſt the only emperor who had peaceably ſucceeded his father for above two centuries. During his reign the image-worſhippers underwent a greater perſecution than ever. Theſe long perſecutions ſhew us plainly that the people were divided among themſelves.

It is remarkable that two women were the reſtorers of images: one was the empreſs Irene, the other Theodora, widow to Theophilus.

Theodora, miſtreſs of the empire of the Eaſt, during the non-age of her ſon Michael, perſecuted in her turn the enemies of image-worſhip: but in this ſhe carried her zeal, or her politics, ſtill farther than the other party had done: for in Aſia Minor there was a great number of the Manichean ſect *, who lived quietly and peaceably, becauſe the fury of enthuſiaſm, which ſeldom rages but at the firſt eſtabliſhment of a ſect, was over with them: now theſe people were grown rich by induſtry and trade; and, whether the deſign was upon their treaſures, or their opinions, the moſt ſevere edicts

* This was a ſect founded in Perſia, in the third century, by a ſlave called Curbicus, who aſſumed the name of Manes, and even ſtiled himſelf the Holy Ghoſt. Like the Magi, he taught there were two principles that governed all things, one good, the other evil.

were iſſued againſt them, and enforced with the extremeſt cruelty. Perſecution revived their original fanaticiſm, and thouſands of them died under the torture, whilſt the reſt, driven to deſpair, threw off all ſubjection, and took up arms in their own defence.

846 Above forty thouſand of them went over to the Mahometans, and from the peaceable, inoffenſive Manicheans, became implacable enemies to the empire; and, joining with the Saracens, carried deſolation and havoc through all Aſia Minor, to the very gates of the imperial city, which had been depopulated by a dreadful plague in 842, and was become an object of pity.

The plague, properly ſo called, is, as the ſmall pox, a diſorder peculiar to the people of Africa, and is brought over to us from thoſe countries in merchant-ſhips. It would ſoon overſpread all Europe, were it not for the wiſe precautions taken in our ſea-ports; and it was very probably owing to the negligence of the government in this particular, that it found entrance into the imperial city.

And this very inattention expoſed the empire to another ſcourge: the Ruſſians embarked at the port now called Aſoph, on the Black Sea, and came and ravaged all the ſea-coaſt of the Pontus Euxinus. The Arabs, on the other hand, puſhed their conqueſts beyond Armenia, and into Aſia Minor. At length Michael the younger, after a reign of cruelty and misfortunes, was aſſaſſinated by Baſilius, whom he had raiſed from the moſt abject condition, and made partner with him in the empire.

Baſilius's adminiſtration was not more fortunate than that of his predeceſſor: this reign is the epocha of the grand ſchiſm which divided the Greek church from the Latin.

The miſeries of the empire were not greatly repaired under Leo, called the Philoſopher; not from his being an Antonius, a Marcus Aurelius, a Julian, an Aaroun Alraſchid, or an Alfred, but on account of his being learned. He paſſes for the firſt who opened the Turks a way into the empire, who, a long time afterwards, made themſelves maſters of Conſtantinople.

It

It is doubtful whether the Turks, (who afterwards ſought againſt the Saracens, and incorporated with them, were their ſupport, and the deſtroyers of the Greek empire) had already ſent colonies into the countries bordering on the Danube? We have no authentic hiſtories of theſe emigrations of Barbarians.

This is, in all likelihood, the manner of life which mankind had led for a long ſucceſſion of time; no ſooner was a country cultivated, than it was invaded by a hungry people, who again in their turns were driven out by others. Do we not find that the Gauls made deſcents on Italy, and penetrated as far as Aſia Minor? and have not twenty different nations come from Great Tartary in ſearch of new lands?

Notwithſtanding all the diſaſters that had befel Conſtantinople, it continued for a long time to be the moſt opulent and beſt peopled of all the Chriſtian cities, and the moſt eminent for the polite arts. Its ſituation alone, by which it has the command of two ſeas, neceſſarily made it a place of trade. The plague in 842, notwithſtanding the great havoc it made, was but a temporary ſcourge: cities, which are the ſeats of commerce, and where the court holds its reſidence, are quickly repeopled by the continual concourſe from other neighbouring nations. Neither the mechanic nor polite arts can be loſt in a great capital, which is the reſidence of the rich.

All theſe ſudden court-revolutions, and the crimes of ſo many emperors, murdered by one another, are ſtorms which never fall upon private heads, who are left to cultivate in peace the profeſſions which no one envies them.

The riches of the empire were far from being exhauſted: we are told, that in 857, Theodora, mother to the emperor Michael, when, much againſt her will, ſhe was obliged to part with the regency, and was treated nearly in the ſame manner by her ſon as Mary of Medicis was of late days by Lewis XIII. gave the emperor to underſtand, that there was in his treaſury an hundred and nine thouſand pounds weight of gold, and three hundred thouſand of ſilver.

It was in the power then of a wiſe adminiſtration to have ſtill ſupported the power of the empire. It was contracted indeed, but not diſmembered, often changing its emperors, but always united under the perſon who wayed the ſceptre, and was beſides richer, better furniſhed with reſources, and more powerful than that of Germany. Yet it is now no more, and the German empire ſtill ſubſiſts.

CHAP. XX.

Of ITALY and the POPES, together with the Divorce of LOTHARIUS King of LORRAIN, and other affairs relating to the CHURCH in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries.

THAT we may not loſe the chain which links together ſo many events, let us recal to mind with what prudence the popes conducted themſelves under Pepin and Charlemagne; how dextrouſly they ſtifled all religious diſputes, and in what manner each of them ſecretly eſtabliſhed the foundation of the pontifical grandeur.

Their power was already become very great, ſince Gregory IV. repaired the port of Oſtia, and Leo IV. fortified Rome at his own expence. But all the popes could not be great men, nor could every conjuncture prove alike favourable to them. Every vacancy of the papal ſee cauſed the ſame diſturbances at Rome as the election of a king does in Poland. The pontiff elect was obliged at the ſame time to manage the Roman ſenate, the people, and the emperor. The Roman nobility held a great ſhare in the government; and, at that time, had the chuſing of two conſuls every year, and the making a prefect, which was a kind of tribune of the people. They had a court of twelve ſenators, and theſe had the nomination of the principal officers of the duchy of Rome. This municipal government poſſeſſed, ſometimes

times a greater, ſometimes a leſſer, degree of authority. The popes of Rome had rather a higher degree of credit, than any real legiſlative power.

However, if they were not ſovereigns of Rome, they loſt no occaſion of exerciſing a ſupreme authority over the weſtern church. The biſhops ſet up for judges of kings, and the popes claimed judicial authority over the biſhops; but nothing can give us a clearer inſight into the numberleſs diſputes about authority, the farrago of religious ſuperſtition and weakneſs, the knavery that prevailed in all their courts of juſtice, and the inſufficiency of the laws themſelves, than the ſtory of the marriage and divorce of Lotharius king of Lorrain, nephew to Charles the Bald.

Charlemagne had repudiated one of his wives and married another, not only with the approbation of pope Stephen, but actually in conſequence of that pontiff's preſſing ſolicitations. The kings Gontram, Caribert, Sigebert, Chilperic, and Dagobert, had had ſeveral wives at a time, without the leaſt murmur being made; and, if it was a ſcandal, it was not attended with any diſturbance. Lotharius having married Teutberga, daughter of a duke of Burgundia Transjurana, reſolves to put her away upon being accuſed of inceſt with her own brother, and to marry his miſtreſs Valrada. What follows of this ſtory is ſingularly romantic: at firſt the queen proves her innocence by the trial of boiling water: her champion plunges his hand into a veſſel of boiling water, from the bottom of which he brings up a conſecrated ring, without appearing to be the leaſt hurt. Upon which the king complains of ſome trick being uſed in the trial. It is certain, if any ſuch thing was done, that the queen's champion underſtood the ſecret of preparing the ſkin againſt the action of the boiling water: which, it is ſaid, may be done by rubbing the part a long time with a compoſition of ſpirit of vitriol, alum, and the juice of onions. No one of the members of our academy of ſciences have been at the pains to inform themſelves, relative to this pretended method of trial, of what every mountebank is well acquainted with.

862 The ſucceſs of this trial paſſed for a miracle, and the very deciſion of the Almighty himſelf; and yet this Teutberga, juſtified by Heaven, acknowledges to ſeveral biſhops, in the preſence of her confeſſor, that ſhe was really guilty of the crime laid to her charge. There is not the leaſt probability that a prince, who was deſirous to part with his wife on ſuſpicion of adultery, would ever have thought of accuſing her of inceſt with her brother, unleſs the fact had been publicly known. People ſeldom think of looking for crimes of ſo far-fetched and extraordinary a nature, and ſo difficult to be proved: beſides, in thoſe days, what we call the point of honour was entirely unknown. Both king and queen were covered with ſhame in this affair; he by his accuſation, and ſhe by her confeſſion. The two national councils met on this occaſion, and agreed to the divorce.

Pope Nicholas I. diſſolved the two councils, and depoſed Gontier archbiſhop of Cologne, who had been the moſt ſtrenuous in the affair of the divorce: upon which Gontier writes circular letters to all the churches, in theſe terms: "Tho' the lord Nicholas, who is called Pope, and who looks upon himſelf as pope and emperor, has excommunicated us, we have withſtood his fooliſh proceedings." And, in another part of his letter, addreſſing the pope himſelf, he ſays, "We do not acknowledge your curſed ſentence; we deſpiſe it; and even caſt you out of our communion, being ſatisfied with that of our brethren the biſhops, whom you contemn," &c.

A brother of the archbiſhop of Cologne carried himſelf this proteſt to Rome, and laid it upon St. Peter's tomb with ſword in hand; but, in a little time afterwards, the political ſtate of affairs being changed, the ſame archbiſhop changed likewiſe, and repaired in perſon to mount Caſſin, where he proſtrated himſelf at the feet of pope Adrian, the ſucceſſor of this Nicholas, whom he thus addreſſed: "I declare, ſaid he, before God, and in the preſence of his ſaints, and to you my lord Adrian, ſovereign pontiff, and to the biſhops who are under your juriſdiction, and to all this aſſembly, that

that I humbly ſubmit to the ſentence of depoſition canonically denounced againſt me by pope Nicholas," &c. We may eaſily conceive how greatly an example of this kind muſt have ſtrengthened the authority of the church of Rome; and the nature of the times rendered theſe examples frequent.

The ſame Nicholas I. excommunicated the ſecond wife of Lotharius, and ordered that prince to take his firſt wife back again. All Europe took part in theſe tranſactions. The emperor Lewis II. brother to Charles the Bald, and uncle to Lotharius, inſtantly declared himſelf, in the ſtrongeſt manner, for his nephew againſt the pope. This emperor, who reſided in Italy, bid defiance to Nicholas; this brought on an effuſion of blood; and the flames of war were lighted up in Italy. Negotiations were ſet on foot, and the different parties entered into cabals. Teutberga repaired to Rome, to plead her cauſe there; Valrada, her rival, undertook the ſame voyage, but dared not proceed with it. Lotharius, finding himſelf excommunicated, went thither in perſon to aſk pardon of Adrian II. ſucceſſor to Nicholas; fearing leſt his uncle Charles the Bald, who had taken arms againſt him under the banner of the church, ſhould ſeize on his kingdom of Lorrain. Adrian II. when he gave him the ſacrament at Rome, made him ſwear that he had not made uſe of the rights of marriage with Valrada, after the order which pope Nicholas had ſent him to abſtain from it. Lotharius accepted this oath, received the ſacrament, and died in a ſhort time afterwards. The hiſtorians of thoſe times have not failed to aſſert, that his ſudden death was a puniſhment on him for his perjury; and that thoſe of his domeſtics who had taken the ſame oath with him, all died within the year.

The prerogative aſſumed on this occaſion by Nicholas I. and Adrian II. was founded on the falſe decretals, which were, even at that time, regarded as the univerſal code. The civil contract by which a couple were united, being become a ſacrament, was ſubject to eccleſiaſtical deciſion.

This

This adventure was the firſt ſcandal that happened relating to the marriage of crowned heads in the empire of the weſt. Since that we have ſeen the kings of France, Robert, Philip I. and Philip Auguſtus, excommunicated by the popes on the ſame occaſions, or even for marriages contracted between very diſtant relations. The national biſhops did, for a long time, aſſume the right of being judges in theſe cauſes: the pontiffs of Rome always referred theſe cauſes to them.

We ſhall not pretend to examine in this place how far this new law was uſeful or detrimental, as we do not write in the character of a civilian or a controvertiſt: but it is certain that theſe proceedings occaſioned much ſcandal and diſturbance to all the Chriſtian provinces. The antient Romans and the people of the Eaſt were much happier in this point. The rights of the father of a family, and the ſecrets of the marriage-bed were never laid open to the eye of the public curioſity: they were wholly unacquainted with theſe kinds of proceſſes relating to marriages and divorces.

This deſcendant of Charlemagne was the firſt who ever went three hundred leagues from his own kingdom, to plead his cauſe before a foreign judge, and to know what woman he was to love. His ſubjects were on the brink of falling victims to theſe unhappy differences. Lewis the Debonnaire had been the firſt example of the power of the biſhops over the emperors. Lotharius of Lorrain fixed the epocha of the pope's authority over the biſhops. Upon the whole, then, we may gather from the hiſtory of theſe times, that there were very few rules for ſociety among the weſtern nations; that the kingdoms were very weak in laws; and that the church was very willing to give them new ones.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Of PHOTIUS, and the Schiſm between the EASTERN and WESTERN CHURCHES.

THE weightieſt affair which the church was then engaged in, and which is, to this very day, of the greateſt importance to her, was the origin of the total ſeparation of the Greek and Latin churches. The patriarchal chair of Conſtantinople being, as well as the throne, the object of ambition, was equally ſubject to revolutions. The emperor Michael III. being diſſatisfied with the patriarch Ignatius, compelled him to ſign his own diſmiſſion, and put one Photius in his place, who was an eunuch of the palace, a man of great quality, prodigious genius, and univerſal knowledge: he was maſter of the horſe to Michael, and miniſter of ſtate. The biſhops, to prepare the way for ordaining him patriarch, made him paſs through all the requiſite degrees in ſix days time. The firſt day he was made monk, becauſe the monks were at that time conſidered as conſtituting a part of the hierarchy; the ſecond day he was made lecturer; the third ſub-deacon; the next deacon, then prieſt, and laſtly, on Chriſtmas-day 858, was declared patriarch.

Pope Nicholas took part with Ignatius, and excommunicated Photius, reproaching him chiefly with having paſſed in ſo ſhort a time from the ſtate of a layman to the dignity of a biſhop. To this Photius replied, with reaſon on his ſide, that St. Ambroſe, governor of Milan, and ſcarcely, in fact, a Chriſtian, had with ſtill greater rapidity paſſed from the one to the other ſtate, and joined the epiſcopal dignity with that of governor; and accordingly excommunicated the pope in his turn, declaring him depoſed from his pontifical function. He then took the title of œcumenical patriarch, and openly accuſed the biſhops of the Weſt, who were in the pope's communion, of hereſy. The principal objection he brought againſt them, was the holding the proceſſion from

from the father and the ſon. "A ſet of men (ſays he in one of his letters) ſprung out of the darkneſs of the Weſt, have corrupted all things by their ignorance; and, to put the finiſhing hand to their impiety, have dared to add new words to the ſacred ſymbol authoriſed by all the councils, by ſaying, that the Holy Ghoſt does not proceed from the Father alone, but from the Son alſo, which is at once renouncing all Chriſtianity."

By this paſſage, and ſeveral others of the like kind, we may perceive the ſuperiority the Greek church affected in all things over that of the Latins. They pretended that the Romiſh church was indebted for every thing to the Greek, even for the names of their cuſtoms, ceremonies, myſteries, and dignities, baptiſms, the euchariſt, liturgy, dioceſe, pariſh, biſhop, prieſt, deacon, monk, church, all was Greek; and they looked upon the Latins as ſo many ignorant ſcholars, who had rebelled againſt their maſters.

The other ſubjects of anathema were, that the Latins made uſe of unleavened bread in the euchariſt; that they eat eggs and cheeſe in Lent; and that their prieſts did not ſhave their beards. Strange reaſons theſe for creating a breach between the eaſtern and the weſtern churches!

But every impartial perſon muſt allow that Photius was not only the moſt learned of any of the churchmen of thoſe times, but likewiſe a great biſhop. He followed the conduct of St. Ambroſe; for when Baſilius, who had murdered the emperor Michael, preſented himſelf to communicate in the church of St. Sophia, he told him with a loud voice, "That he was not worthy to approach the holy myſteries, who had his hands yet ſtained with the blood of his benefactor." Photius did not find a Theodoſius in Baſilius: that tyrant did an act of juſtice from a motive of revenge; he depoſed Photius, and reinſtated Ignatius in the patriarchal chair. Rome took advantage of this conjuncture to call the eighth
869 œcumenical council at Conſtantinople, compoſed of three hundred biſhops. The pope's legates preſided there; but not one of them knew a word of Greek, and very few of the biſhops underſtood Latin.

Latin. Photius was, by the general voice, declared an intruder, and condemned to do public penance. The names of the five patriarchs were ſigned before that of the pope, which was very extraordinary: for, as the legates held the firſt place, they were undoubtedly entitled to ſign the firſt. In all this ſeſſion there was not a word mentioned of the diſputes which then divided the two churches: their whole aim was to depoſe Photius.

A ſhort time after, the true patriarch, Ignatius, dying, Photius had the addreſs to get himſelf reinſtated by the emperor Baſilius. Pope John VII. received him into his communion, acknowledged him as patriarch, wrote to him, and, notwithſtanding he had been publicly anathematized by the eighth œcumenical council, the pope ſent legates to another council at Conſtantinople, in which Photius was declared innocent by four hundred biſhops, three hundred of which had before ſigned the ſentence of condemnation; and the very legates of the ſame ſee of Rome, who had concurred in anathematizing him, were now the inſtruments of annulling the decree of the eighth œcumenical council.

How ſurpriſingly do things change with mankind! and how frequently does that become truth, according to particular times and circumſtances, which but a little before was falſe! "Whoſoever ſhall not acknowledge the authority of Photius, cried the legates of John VIII. in full council, let his lot be with Judas." "Long life to our patriarch Photius, and to pope John," replied the council.

Moreover, at the end of the acts of this council, we find a letter from the pope to this learned patriarch, wherein he ſays, "We think after the ſame manner as yourſelf; we hold for tranſgreſſors of the word of God, and rank with Judas, all thoſe who have added to the ſymbol, that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father and the ſon; but we think that it is beſt to uſe lenity towards them, and only to exhort them to renounce their blaſphemy."

It is evident, then, that the Roman and Greek churches thought differently at that time, to what they do

do now. It happened afterwards that Rome adopted the proceſſion from the Father and the Son, and it even fell out that, in the year 1274, when Michael Paleologus was applying for a new cruſade againſt the Turks, and ſent his patriarch and chancellor to the ſecond council of Lyons, they both joined with the council in ſinging in Latin, *qui ex patre filioque procedit*. But the Greek church returned to its former opinion, and again ſeemed to depart from it in the tranſient union which it made with pope Eugenius IV. Let mankind from hence learn to tolerate the opinions of each other: here we have ſeen differences and diſputes upon a fundamental point, without either raiſing diſturbances in the ſtate, or bringing any one to the dungeon or the ſtake.

Thoſe who blame pope John VIII. for the conceſſion he made to the patriarch Photius, do not ſufficiently conſider that this pontiff ſtood in need at that time of the aſſiſtance of the emperor Baſilius. A king of Bulgaria named Bogoris, overcome by the artifices of his wife, embraced the Chriſtian religion, after the example of Clovis and king Egbert. It now became a queſtion, on which patriarchate this new Chriſtian province was to depend. Conſtantinople and Rome diſputed it with each other; the deciſion reſted with the emperor Baſilius. This was in ſome meaſure the occaſion of that condeſcenſion, which the biſhop of Rome ſhewed towards him of Conſtantinople.

We muſt not forget that there were cardinals in this council, as well as in the preceding one. This was a title then given to all prieſts and deacons who aſſiſted the metropolitans with their advice; Rome had them as well as the other churches. They were of ſome conſideration even at that time: but did not ſign till after the biſhops and abbots.

The pope, both in his letters, and by his legates, gave the title of holineſs to the patriarch Photius: the other patriarchs are likewiſe in this council called popes. This is a Greek appellation, and common to all prieſts; but by degrees it has become the diſtinguiſhing title of the metropolitan of Rome.

Pope

Pope John VIII. ſeems to have managed with great prudence; for when his ſucceſſors, on having a diſpute with the Greek empire, adopted the eighth œcumenical council of 869, and rejected that which had abſolved Photius, the peace eſtabliſhed by John was preſently broke. Photius inveighed loudly againſt the church of Rome, upbraiding it with hereſy in relation to the article *filioque procedit*, the eating of eggs in Lent, the uſing of unleavened bread in the euchariſt, and ſeveral other cuſtoms. But the grand point of diviſion was the primacy. Photius and his ſucceſſors wanted to be the firſt biſhops of Chriſtendom, and could not bear that a biſhop of Rome, a city which they looked upon as barbarous, ſeparated by rebellion from the empire, and a prey to any one who thought it worth while to take poſſeſſion of it, ſhould hold precedency over the biſhop of the imperial city. The patriarch of Conſtantinople, at that time, reckoned all the churches of Sicily and Apulia in his diſtrict; and when the holy ſee came under a foreign dominion, it loſt at the ſame time its patrimonial and metropolitan rights in thoſe provinces. The Greek church held that of Rome in great contempt. The ſciences flouriſhed in Conſtantinople, but in Rome every thing fell to decay, even to the Latin tongue itſelf; and though poſſeſſed of more knowledge than any other part of the Weſt, yet the little learning they had bore a ſtrong tincture of the unhappineſs of the times. The Greeks now took ample revenge for the ſuperiority the Romans had exerciſed over them, from the time of Lucretia and Cicero to that of Cornelius Tacitus. They never mentioned the Romans but in the moſt contemptuous manner. Biſhop Luitprand, who was ſent on an embaſſy to Conſtantinople by the Othos, relates, that the Greeks, when they ſpoke of St. Gregory the Great, called him by no other name than Gregory the Dialogiſt; as his dialogues, in truth, ſeem to be the productions of a very weak genius. But time has changed the face of affairs. The popes are become powerful ſovereigns, Rome the center of politeneſs and the fine arts, and the Latin church learned; while the patriarch of Conſtantinople

is

is at preſent a ſlave, or, at beſt, the biſhop of a people in ſlavery.

Photius *, whoſe life was a ſcene rather of adverſity than glory, was depoſed by the intrigues of a party at court, and died miſerably: however his ſucceſſors adhered to his pretenſions, and ſupported them with vigour.

Pope John VIII. finiſhed his life in a ſtill more wretched manner; for, if we believe the annals of Fulda, he was beat to death with hammers. The enſuing times will ſhew us the pontifical ſeat frequently bathed in blood, and Rome the principal, but, at the ſame time, the moſt pitiable object of all other nations.

The weſtern church was not as yet diſturbed by dogmatical diſputes; we barely hear of a trifling conteſt raiſed in 814, by one John Godeſcald, relating to predeſtination and grace; and I ſhall take little notice of a kind of epidemic folly with which the people of Dijon were ſeized in 844, on occaſion of one St. Benignus, who, they ſay, cauſed convulſions in thoſe who paid their devotions at his tomb. I ſhould not take any notice, I ſay, of this piece of popular ſuperſtition, had it not been revived of later times with great fury, and under almoſt the ſame circumſtances. It ſeems as if the ſame follies were deſtined to make their appearance again at ſtated times on this great theatre of the world: but then good ſenſe is found the ſame at all times, and nothing has been more wiſely ſaid on the modern miracles, lately

* Photius was a perſon of illuſtrious birth, had been captain of the emperor's guards, ambaſſador in Perſia, and ſecretary of ſtate: all his learning he acquired by the ſtrength of his own genius and application, without the aſſiſtance of teachers. He compoſed ſeveral homilies, ſcholaſtic tracts called Gnomiques, diſſertations on theology and amphilogia, two treatiſes on the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, four books againſt the new Manicheans, a commentary on the epiſtle of St. Paul, now extant in M. S. in the Univerſity-library of Cambridge, annotations on the Prophets, a treatiſe againſt an heretic, a treatiſe againſt the Latins, a collection of the rights of metropolitans, with a lexicon: a commentary on ſome parts of Ariſtotle, and the catalogue of his library, containing an account and criticiſm of two hundred and eighty authors.

lately performed on the tomb of a certain deacon of Paris, than what was ſaid by a biſhop of Lyons in 844, relating to thoſe of Dijon. "This is a ſtrange ſort of ſaint ſurely, who maims thoſe who pay their addreſſes to him. I ſhould think that miracles ought to be performed rather for curing diſeaſes than inflicting them."

But theſe trifles in no wiſe diſturbed the peace of the Weſt; and theological diſputes were in thoſe times held for nothing, becauſe no one thought of growing great by them. They had more weight indeed in the Eaſt, becauſe the prelates of that church never being admitted to any ſhare of ſecular government, ſtudied to make themſelves of conſequence by the war of the pen. There is yet another reaſon to be given for the theological calm which reigned in the Weſt, namely, the ignorance of the clergy, which was at leaſt productive of this one good, amidſt the numberleſs evils of which it was otherwiſe the cauſe.

CHAP. XXII.

The State of the WESTERN EMPIRE towards the End of the Ninth Century.

THE empire of the Weſt ſubſiſted now only in name. Arnould, Arnold, or Arnolf, a baſtard ſon of Carloman, made himſelf maſter of Germany; but Italy was divided between two lords, both of the blood of Charlemagne, by the mother's ſide. The one of theſe was named Guy, duke of Spoleto, the other Berengerius or Beringer, duke of Friuli. Both theſe lords had been inveſted with theſe duchies by Charles the Bald, and both made pretenſions to the empire as well as to the kingdom of France. Arnold on his ſide, in quality of emperor, looked upon France as belonging to him of right; while that kingdom, rent from the empire, was divided between Charles the Simple, who loſt it, and king Eudes, great uncle to Hugh Capet, who uſurped it.

But

But there was yet another pretender to the empire, namely, one Bozo, or Bozon, king of Arles. Now at that time, Formoſus, the inſignificant biſhop of unhappy Rome, dared not to refuſe the ſacred unction to whomſoever was ſtrong enough to demand it. Accordingly he conferred the crown on this Guy, duke of Spoleto. The very next year he did the ſame for Berengerius, who was then the conqueror: and not long af-
894 ter he was again obliged to crown Arnold, who came in perſon, and laid ſiege to Rome, which he took by aſſault. The equivocal oath, which Arnold received from the Romans, proves that even at that time the popes pretended to the ſovereignty of Rome. The form of the oath was as follows: "I ſwear by the holy myſteries, that ſaving my honour, the laws of my country, and the fidelity I owe to my lord Formoſus, the pope, I will be true and faithful to the emperor Arnold."

The popes at that time, in ſome meaſure, reſembled the caliphs of Bagdat, who were revered by all the Mahometan ſtates, as the heads of their religion; but yet had no other privilege left them than that of beſtowing the inveſtiture of kingdoms on thoſe who demanded them ſword in hand: but there was this difference between the one and the other, that the caliphs were fallen from their authority, whereas the popes were every day riſing in theirs.

In reality there was no longer an empire, either in right, or in fact. The Romans, who had ſubmitted themſelves to Charlemagne with univerſal aſſent, would not however acknowledge baſtards, foreigners, and perſons who were hardly maſters of the ſmalleſt part of Germany.

The Roman people, in the midſt of their humiliation, and intermixture with foreigners, ſtill preſerved, as they do to this day, that ſecret haughtineſs, which is ever the conſequence of former grandeur. They could not bear that the Bructeri, the Catti, and the Marcomanni, ſhould call themſelves deſcendants from their Cæſars, nor that the banks of the Mayne, and the rude foreſts of Hercynia,

Hercynia, ſhould be made the centre of the empire of Titus and Trajan.

It produced an equal mixture of indignation and contempt at Rome, when it was known that after the death of Arnold, his ſon Hiludovic, whom we call Lewis, had been created emperor of the Romans at three or four years of age, in a ſorry village called Forcheim, by a few German barons and biſhops. This child was never reckoned among the emperors, 900 though looked upon in Germany as the perſon who was to ſucceed to the empire of Charlemagne and the Cæſars; and indeed it was a ſtrange ſort of Roman empire, which had not a foot of country between the Rhine and the Maeſe; neither poſſeſſed France, nor Burgundy, nor Spain, nor yet any part of Italy; nor had even a ſingle houſe in Rome that could properly be ſaid to belong to the emperor.

From the time of this Lewis, the laſt German prince of the baſtard blood of Charlemagne, and who died in 912, the Roman empire, now confined to Germany, was in the ſame condition as France, a country waſted by foreign and domeſtic wars, and governed by a prince choſen by faction, and obeyed with reluctance.

All governments have their revolutions: there could not be a more amazing one than that which raiſed thoſe ſavage Saxons, who were treated by Charlemagne as the Helots of old were by the Lacedemonians, which raiſed theſe people, I ſay in the ſpace of 112 years, to that dignity which was now loſt to the family of their conqueror. Otho, duke of Saxony, af- 912 ter the death of Lewis, by his intereſt and credit, placed the crown on the head of Conrad, duke of Franconia; and after the death of Conrad, the ſon of Henry the Fowler, ſon to duke Otho of Saxony, was elected emperor. Theſe elections were made by the conjunction of the ſeveral great men who had made themſelves hereditary princes in Germa- 919 ny; and the biſhops, together with the principal citizens of the towns of the empire, who were called in upon the occaſion.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the GERMAN EMPIRE, and its FIEFS.

FORCE, which does every thing in this world, gave Italy and the two Gauls to the Romans. The Barbarians uſurped theſe conqueſts from them. Charlemagne's father uſurped the two Gauls from the kings of the Franks. The governors under the deſcendants of Charlemagne, uſurped in their turns whatever they could. The kings of Lombardy had already eſtabliſhed fiefs in Italy, which ſerved as models for all the dukes and counts from the time of Charles the Bald; and, by degrees, what were at firſt only governments, came now to be hereditary rights. The biſhops of ſeveral large ſees, already very powerful by their dignity, had but one ſtep further to take in order to become princes; and this ſtep they were not long in taking. This gave riſe to the temporal power of the biſhops of Mentz, Cologne, Triers, Wurtſburg, and a number of others both in Germany and France. The archbiſhops of Rheims, Lyons, Beauvais, Langres and Laon, laid claim to the royalties, or king's rights. This aſſumed power of the Clergy did not laſt long in France, but in Germany it has been confirmed for a conſiderable time. In ſhort, even abbots at length became princes: witneſs the abbots of Fulda, of St. Gal, of Kempten, Corbie, &c. who became petty kings, in the very place where, not above fourſcore years before, they had, with their own hands, cleared the lands which had been beſtowed upon them, by the charitable proprietors, for their ſubſiſtence. All thoſe lords, dukes, counts, marquiſſes, biſhops, and abbots paid homage to the ſovereign. The origin of this feudal right has long been the ſubject of enquiry. It may be ſuppoſed that it was no other than the antient cuſtom which has prevailed among all nations, of the ſtronger impoſing an homage and tribute on the weaker. We know that the Roman emperors afterwards gave away lands in perpetuity, on certain conditions; and

we

we have ſeveral inſtances of this, in the lives of Alexander Severus, and the emperor Probus. The Lombards were the firſt who erected duchies to be held in fief of their kingdom. Spoleto and Benevento were hereditary dukedoms under the kings of Lombardy.

Before the time of Charlemagne, Taſſillo held the dukedom of Bavaria on condition of homage: and this dukedom would have gone to his deſcendants, if Charlemagne, after conquering this prince, had not diſpoſſeſſed both the father and the children.

The conſequence of this was, that there were few free towns in Germany, therefore little or no trade; and of courſe not much riches: nay, ſome of the towns had not even walls to defend them: and this ſtate, which might have been ſo powerful, was now become ſo weak, through the number and diviſion of its maſters, that the emperor Conrad was obliged to promiſe a yearly tribute to the Hungarians, Huns, or Pannonians, a people who had been ſo well kept within bounds by Charlemagne, and were afterwards ſo humbled by the emperors of the houſe of Auſtria; but at that time they ſeemed to be the ſame they had been under the famous Attila. They ravaged Germany and the frontiers of France; they made incurſions into Italy thro' Tyrol, after having plundered Bavaria, and then returned loaded with the ſpoils of the many nations they had over-run.

It was in the reign of Henry the Fowler, that Germany began to emerge a little from its chaos. Its boundaries were then the river Oder, Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, the Banks of the Rhine, the Scheld, the Moſelle, and the Maeſe: and Pomerania and Holſtein were its barriers towards the North.

Henry the Fowler muſt undoubtedly have been a prince the moſt worthy of reigning. Under him we find the German lords, before ſo di- 920 vided, were united. The firſt fruits of this union was ſhaking off the tribute which had been paid to the Hungarians; and a ſignal victory gained over this nation, which before appeared ſo formidable. Henry cauſed moſt of the cities of Germany to be encompaſſed with

with walls. He inſtituted militias; and ſome ſay that he was the inventor of certain military games, which gave the firſt idea of tournaments. In ſhort, under him Germany began to recover herſelf; but we do not find that ſhe pretended to the Roman empire. Henry the Fowler had been conſecrated by the archbiſhop of Mentz; but neither a legate from the pope, nor any deputy from the people of Rome, aſſiſted at the ceremony. It ſeems as if Germany, during all this reign, had utterly forgot Italy.

But it was otherwiſe under the reign of Otho the Great, whom the German princes, biſhops, and abbots, unanimouſly elected emperor upon the death
936 of Henry his father. The acknowledged heir of a powerful prince, who has been the founder or reſtorer of a kingdom, is always more powerful than his father, if he be not wanting in courage and reſolution; for he enters upon a career which is already opened for him, and begins where his predeceſſor had ended. Thus Alexander went farther than his father Philip; Charlemagne farther than Pepin; and Otho the Great far ſurpaſſed Henry the Fowler.

CHAP. XXIV.

Of OTHO the Great in the Tenth Century.

OTHO, who reſtored a part of the empire of Charlemagne, like him propagated the Chriſtian faith in Germany, by conqueſt. He obliged the Danes, by force of arms, to pay him a tribute, and to re-
948 ceive baptiſm, which had been preached to them above a century before, and which was now utterly aboliſhed amongſt them.

Theſe Danes or Normans, who had conquered Neuſtria and England, and over-run France and Germany, received law from Otho. He eſtabliſhed biſhops in Denmark, who were at that time ſubject to the archbiſhop of Hambourg, metropolitan of the barbarous churches founded afterwards in Holſtein, Sweden, and Denmark.

Denmark. The whole of chriſtianity conſiſted then in making the ſign of the croſs. This prince likewiſe ſubdued Bohemia, after an obſtinate war. From his time, Bohemia and Denmark were reputed provinces of the empire; but the Danes quickly ſhook off their yoke.

Otho was now become the moſt conſiderable monarch of the weſtern hemiſphere, and the arbiter of princes: and ſo great was his authority at that time, that Lewis, the foreigner, king of France, ſon to Charles the Simple, the deſcendant of Charlemagne, being come to a council of biſhops held by Otho, near to Mentz, in 948, delivered himſelf in the following words which are to be found in the collection of the acts of that council.

"I was acknowledged and conſecrated king, by the "ſuffrages of all the lords and nobleſſe of the kingdom "of France; notwithſtanding which, I have been "treacherouſly driven from my dominions by Hugh, "who has detained me as a priſoner, during a whole "year, without my being able to obtain my liberty, "otherwiſe than by ceding to him the city of Laon, "which was the only town I had left for my Queen "Gerbegra to hold her court with the reſt of my "houſhold. If I am accuſed of any crime that appears "to deſerve ſuch treatment, I am ready to acquit my-"ſelf by the judgment of a council, and agreeable to the "orders of king Otho; or elſe by ſingle combat."

This remarkable and important ſpeech, ſerves at once to prove ſeveral things, viz. the great power of Otho; the weakneſs of France; the practice of ſingle combats, and the eſtabliſhed cuſtom of beſtowing crowns, not according to hereditary right, but by the ſuffrages of the lords and great men of the nation: a cuſtom ſoon after utterly aboliſhed in France.

Such was the power of Otho the Great, when he was invited to paſs the Alps by the Italians themſelves; who, ever factious and feeble, could neither ſubmit to be governed by their own countrymen, to remain free; nor were able to defend themſelves, at the ſame time, againſt the Saracens and Hungarians, who ſtill infeſted Italy by their incurſions.

Italy, which, even in its ruins, was the richeſt and moſt flouriſhing country of the Weſt, was inceſſantly torn in pieces by tyrants. But, in all theſe diviſions, Rome ſtill continued to be the ſpring which gave motion to all the other cities of Italy. If we reflect on what Paris was in the time of the league; and again, under the reign of Charles *the mad*; and what London was under the unhappy Charles I. we ſhall have ſome idea of the ſtate of Rome in the tenth century. The pontifical chair was oppreſſed, diſhonoured, and frequently ſtained with blood; and the elections of the popes were carried on in a manner, of which there has been no example, either in former or ſucceeding times.

CHAP. XXV.

Of the PAPACY, in the Tenth Century, before OTHO the GREAT made himſelf maſter of Rome.

THE ſcandals and inteſtine diviſions which gave ſo much trouble to Rome and its church in the tenth century, and which continued for ſo long a time, happened neither under the Greek nor Latin emperors, nor yet under the kings of Lombardy, nor during the reign of Charlemagne. They were evidently the conſequences of anarchy: and this anarchy was occaſioned by theſe very ſteps which were taken by the popes to prevent it; when, thro' a miſtaken policy, they invited the Franks into Italy. Had they really been in poſſeſſion of all the territories which they pretended Charlemagne had given to them, they would have been much more powerful ſovereigns than they are, even at preſent. The order and rule of elections and adminiſtration would have been the ſame as they are now. But all their pretenſions were diſputed then. Italy was ever the object of ambition to foreigners; and the fate of Rome always uncertain. Let it ſtill be remembered, that the principal object of the Romans was to reſtore the antient republic; that tyrants were ſtarting up in different

ferent parts of Italy and of Rome; that the elections were ſeldom, if ever, free; and that every thing was carried by faction and cabal.

Pope Formoſus, ſon to Leo the Prieſt, when biſhop of Oporto, had headed a faction againſt Pope John VIII. for which he had twice been excommunicated by that pontiff: but theſe excommunications, which afterwards became ſo terrible to crowned heads, were of ſo little conſequence to Formoſus, that he got himſelf elected Pope in 890.

Stephen VI. or VII. alſo the ſon of a prieſt, and who ſucceeded Formoſus, joined all the virulence of faction to the ſpirit of fanaticiſm; and, having always been the declared enemy of Formoſus while living, ordered his dead body, which had been embalmed, to be taken up again, cauſed it to be clad in the pontifical robes, and brought before a council, which had been purpoſely aſſembled to ſit in judgment on his memory. The deceaſed had council allowed him, and was tried in form; and the lifeleſs trunk was found guilty of having exchanged biſhoprics, by quitting the ſee of Oporto for that of Rome, for which it was condemned to have its head ſtruck off by the hangman, three of the fingers of the right hand cut off, and the body caſt into the Tiber; which ſentence was accordingly executed. 897

Stephen rendered himſelf ſo odious, by this no leſs ridiculous than horrible farce, that the friends of the deceaſed Formoſus quickly found means to raiſe the citizens againſt him, who loaded him with chains, and caſt him into priſon; where, ſoon after, he was ſtrangled.

The faction who depoſed Stephen cauſed diligent ſearch to be made for the body of Formoſus, which they interred in a pontifical manner, for the ſecond time.

Theſe diſputes only ſerved to inflame the minds of the people. Sergius III. who filled all Rome with his intrigues to get himſelf elected pope, was baniſhed by his rival John IX. a friend of Formoſus; but, being acknowledged pope, after the death of John IX. he again condemned the memory of Formoſus. 907

During theſe troubles, Theodora, mother of Marozia,

whom ſhe afterwards married to the marquis of Tuſcany, with another Theodora, all three of them notorious for their amours, bore the principal ſway in Rome. Sergius owed his election entirely to his mother Theodora; and, during the time of his pontificate, he had a ſon by Marozia, whom he publicly educated in his palace. This pontiff does not appear to have been hated by the people of Rome; who, being naturally addicted to debauchery, rather followed, than cenſured his example.

After his deceaſe, the two ſiſters, Marozia and Theodora, procured the papal chair for one of their
912 favourites, named Lando; but this Lando dying in a ſhort time, the younger Theodora got her gallant John X. choſen pope, who had been biſhop of Bologna, afterwards of Ravenna; and now of Rome. However, he eſcaped the cenſure that fell on Formoſus for having exchanged biſhoprics. Theſe popes, whom poſterity have been taught to look upon as irreligious prelates, were, however, far from being bad princes. This John X. whom love had made a pope, was a man endowed with a great ſhare of genius and courage. He did more than all his predeceſſors had been able to do. He drove the Saracens out of that part of Italy called the Garrillan.

In order to render this expedition ſucceſsful, he artfully prevailed on the emperor of Conſtantinople to furniſh him with a body of troops; though this emperor had as much reaſon to complain of the rebellious Romans as of the Saracens. He obliged the count of Capua to take up arms, and got the militia of Tuſcany to join him. He then put himſelf at the head of his army, taking with him a young ſon of Marozia, and the marquis Adelbert; and, marching againſt the Mahometans, drove them from the neighbourhood of Rome; after which he formed the project of delivering Italy from the Germans and other foreigners.

Italy was then invaded, almoſt at the ſame time, by the two Berengers, by a king of Burgundy, and by a king of Arles: but this active pontiff prevented them all from having any maſtery in Rome. However, ſome few

few years after, Guy, uterine brother to Hugh, king of Arles, and the tyrant of Italy, having married Marozia, who was all-powerful at Rome; this very Marozia conſpired againſt the pope, who had been ſo long her ſiſter's gallant; and had him ſeized, impriſoned, and ſmothered between two matraſſes.

Marozia, now miſtreſs of Rome, procured one Leo to be elected pope; whom, a few 929
months after, ſhe cauſed to be thrown into priſon and murdered. After this, ſhe gave the chair to an obſcure fellow, who lived but two years; and at laſt ſhe conferred the papal dignity on her own ſon,
John XI. the fruit of her adulterous commerce 931
with Sergius III.

John XI. was but barely twenty-four years old when his mother made him pope; who inveſted him with this dignity, on condition that he ſhould confine himſelf to his epiſcopal function, and be no other than her chaplain.

It is ſaid, this Marozia afterwards poiſoned her huſband, Guy marquis of Tuſcany. It is a fact, that ſhe married her huſband's brother, Hugh king of Lombardy, whom ſhe put in poſſeſſion of Rome, in hopes that ſhe ſhould enjoy the imperial dignity in conjunction with him. But a ſon of her's, by a firſt marriage, headed the Romans againſt his own mother, and drove Hugh out of Rome, and confined Marozia, and the pope her ſon, in Adrian's mole, now called the Caſtle of St. Angelo. Some ſay that John XI. was poiſoned in priſon.

Stephen VIII. a German by birth, was created pope in 939; but, on account of his country, he proved ſo odious to the Romans, that, in a tumult which aroſe in the city, the people ſo diſfigured his face, that he could never afterwards appear in public.

Some time after, a grandſon of Marozia, named Octavianus Sporco, by the great intereſt 956
his family had in Rome, was elected pope at the age of eighteen. He took the name of John XII. out of reſpect to the memory of John XI. his uncle. He was the firſt pope who changed his name upon his acceſſion to the pontificate. He was not in orders when his

friends elected him pope. This John XII. was a patrician, or nobleman of Rome: and, being poſſeſſed of the ſame dignity which Charlemagne formerly had, he united in the pontifical chair the privileges of both temporal and ſpiritual authority, by a power whoſe legality could not be conteſted. But he was young, ſunk in debauchery, and, in other reſpects, far from being a powerful prince.

It is ſurpriſing, that under ſo many ſcandalous and impotent popes, the church of Rome loſt neither her prerogatives nor pretenſions. But then indeed it is to be conſidered that all the other churches were under much the ſame kind of government. The Italian clergy might deſpiſe ſuch popes, but they reſpected the papal function; becauſe they aſpired to that dignity themſelves: in ſhort, the public opinion held the place ſacred, however deteſtable the perſon might be.

While Rome and the church were thus torn in pieces, Berengerius, ſurnamed the Younger, diſputed the poſſeſſion of Italy with Hugh king of Arles. The Italians, as Luitprandus, a contemporary writer, expreſſes himſelf, always wanted two maſters; that they might in fact be ſubject to none; a policy equally falſe and fatal to their peace; as it produced a continual ſucceſſion of new tyrants and new calamities.

Such was the deplorable ſtate of this fine country, when Otho the Great was invited thither by the complaints of almoſt all the towns, and even by this young pope John XII. who was reduced, through the neceſſity of his affairs, to implore the aſſiſtance of Germans; a people of all others the moſt odious to him.

CHAP. XXVI.

Continuation of the Reign of OTHO, and of the State of ITALY.

961 OTHO then entered Italy, where he behaved as Charlemagne had done before him. He conquered Berengerius, who aſpired at

at the ſovereignty, and cauſed himſelf to be conſecrated and crowned emperor of the Romans, by the hands of the pope; after which he took the name of Cæſar and Auguſtus, and compelled the pope to ſwear allegiance to him, upon the tomb where the body of St. Peter is ſaid to be depoſited. An authentic inſtrument of this act was drawn up; and the clergy and nobility of Rome obliged themſelves never to elect a pope, but in preſence of the emperor's commiſſioners. In this act Otho confirms the donations made to the ſee of Rome, by Pepin, Charlemagne, and Lewis the Debonnaire, without ſpecifying the donations in diſpute; "Saving in all things, ſays he, our autho-"rity, and that of our ſon and deſcendants." This inſtrument, written in letters of gold, and ſigned by ſeven German biſhops, five counts, two abbots, and a number of Italian prieſts, is ſtill preſerved in the caſtle of St. Angelo. It is dated the 13th of February, 962. 962

Some writers ſay, and Mezeray after them, that Lotharius king of France, and Hugh Capet, who was afterwards king, aſſiſted at the coronation of Otho. It is certain that the kings of France were at that time ſo weak, that they might ſerve as an ornament at the coronation of an emperor; but neither the name of Lotharius, nor of Hugh Capet, are to be met with among thoſe who ſigned this act.

The pope having thus given himſelf a maſter in him whom he only wanted for a protector, ſoon proved falſe to his oath, and entered into a league againſt the emperor with Berengerius himſelf, who had been driven to take refuge with the Mahometans, ſettled on the coaſt of Provence. He ſent for Berengerius's ſon up to Rome, while Otho was at Pavia. He ſent likewiſe to the Hungarians, to engage them to make incurſions again upon Germany. But he wanted power to carry him through this bold undertaking, and the emperor was ſtrong enough to puniſh him for it.

Otho then returned immediately from Pavia to Rome, and, having ſecured the city, called a council, in which he brought the pope to a formal trial. He convened the German and Roman lords, forty biſhops, and ſeven-

teen cardinals in the church of St. Peter, where, in preſence of all the people, he publicly accuſed the holy father of having lain with ſeveral women, particularly one Etienette, who died in child-bed. The other heads of accuſation were, that he had made a child of ten years of age biſhop of Todi; that he had made a ſale of ordinations and benefices; that he had put out the eyes of one of his relations; that he had cauſed a cardinal to be caſtrated, and afterwards put to death: in fine, that he did not believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and had invoked the devil; two things which ſeem to contradict one another. Thus, as it generally happens, they blended falſhood and truth in their accuſations; but not a ſyllable was mentioned of the true reaſon of aſſembling the council, the emperor being doubtleſs apprehenſive of ſtirring up anew that revolt and conſpiracy, in which even the pope's accuſers themſelves had been concerned. However, this young pontiff, who was then only twenty-ſeven years of age, appears to have been depoſed for his inceſtuous and ſcandalous amours, though it was in truth only for having endeavoured, like every other Roman, to overthrow the German power and authority in Rome.

Otho could not ſeize on the perſon of this pope; or if he could, he was guilty of a great overſight in leaving him his liberty: for no ſooner had he elected Pope Leo VIII. in his room, who, if we will believe Arnold biſhop of Orleans, was neither a churchman, nor even a Chriſtian; ſcarcely had he received the homage of this new pontiff of his own making, and quitted Rome, from which certainly he ought not to have withdrawn himſelf, while affairs were in that ſituation, than John XII. had the courage to ſtir up the Romans again, and, oppoſing council to council, Leo VIII. was depoſed, and at the ſame time an act was paſſed, declaring, "that no inferior could ever degrade his ſuperior."

By this decree, the pope not only meant, that the biſhops and cardinals could never depoſe the pope, but likewiſe hinted at the emperor, whom the biſhops of Rome always regarded as a layman, who owed to the church the very homage and oath of allegiance, which he exacted from her. The cardinal named John, who had written

written and read the accuſations againſt the pope, had his right hand cut off, and the perſon, who acted as regiſter to the council who depoſed him, had his tongue plucked out, and his noſe and two of his fingers cut off.

And yet in all theſe councils, which were guided by the ſpirit of faction and revenge, they conſtantly quoted the goſpels and the fathers, and implored the light of the holy ſpirit, in whoſe name they pretended to ſpeak, and even paſſed ſome uſeful regulations; ſo that a perſon, who reads thoſe acts, without knowing ſomething of hiſtory, would be tempted to believe that he was reading the acts of ſaints.

All this was done almoſt under the emperor's eye; and who can tell how far the courage and reſentment of the young pontiff, and the revolt of the people in his favour, together with the natural antipathy which all the other towns of Italy bore to the German government, might have carried this revolution? But pope John XII. was murdered, about three months after, in the arms of a married woman, whoſe huſband, with his own hands, revenged the injury done to his honour. Writers tell us, that he did not believe in the religion of which he was pontiff, and refuſed, when dying, to receive the ſacrament. 964

This pope, or rather patrician, had inſtilled ſuch courage into the Roman people, that, even after his death, they had the reſolution to ſtand a ſiege, and did not yield till they were driven to the laſt extremity. Otho, twice conqueror of Rome, was now maſter of Italy, as well as Germany.

Pope Leo, a pontiff of Otho's own creation, together with the ſenate, the heads of the people, and the Roman clergy, ſolemnly aſſembled in the church of St. John Lateran, confirmed the emperor's right of chuſing a ſucceſſor to the kingdom of Italy, of confirming the election of a pope, and of giving the inveſtiture to biſhops. After all theſe treaties and oaths extorted by fear, the emperor ſhould have reſided at Rome, to ſee them obſerved.

Scarce was Otho returned back to Germany, when the Romans reſolved to make another effort to recover

their freedom; they ſeized on their new pope, the emperor's creature, and threw him into priſon. The preſect of Rome, the tribunes of the people, and the ſenate, attempted to revive their antient laws; but what at one time is an heroic action, at another becomes a ſeditious revolt. Otho hurries back to Italy, hangs up a part of the ſenate, and cauſes the preſect of Rome, who aimed at being a ſecond Brutus, to be publicly
966 whipped naked through the ſtreets upon an aſs, and afterwards thrown into a dungeon, where he died of hunger.

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Emperors OTHO II. and III. and of ROME.

THIS was nearly the ſituation of Rome, under Otho the Great, and his ſucceſſors Otho II. and III. The Germans held the Romans in ſubjection, and theſe embraced every opportunity of throwing off the yoke, when it was in their power.

A pope, who had been elected by the emperor's order, or at leaſt nominated by him, became the object of general deteſtation with the people of Rome, who ſtill cheriſhed in their hearts the deſign of reſtoring the antient republic; but this noble ambition was productive only of a ſeries of the moſt dreadful and humiliating calamities.

Otho II. marches to Rome againſt his father. What a government! What an empire! And what a pontificate! A conſul named Creſcentius, ſon to pope John X. and the famous Marozia, receiving with this title a ſettled hatred to royalty, armed Rome againſt Otho II. He cauſed pope Benedict VI. the emperor's creature, to be murdered in priſon; and Otho, though at a diſtance, having by his authority, during theſe diſorders, conferred the papal ſee on the chancellor of the empire in Italy, who

who was made pope by the name of John XIV. this unhappy prelate was a new victim ſacrificed by the Roman party. Pope Boniface VII. the creature of the conſul Creſcentius, though already ſtained with the blood of Benedict VI. cauſed John XIV. likewiſe to be put to death. The times of Caligula, Nero, and Vitellius did not produce more deplorable calamities, nor more horrid barbarities. But the villanies and misfortunes of theſe popes are as obſcure as themſelves. Theſe bloody tragedies were performed on the theatre of Rome, when grown weak and ruinated; whereas thoſe of the Cæſars had all the known world for their theatre.

While theſe things were tranſacting, Otho II. arrived at Rome. The pope had formerly ſhaken off the yoke of the emperors of the Eaſt by 981 calling the Franks into Italy. What did they in this preſent conjecture? They ſeemed in appearance ready to return under their old maſters, and, having imprudently called in the Saxon kings, they are now for driving them out again. This very Boniface VII. went in perſon to Conſtantinople, to preſs the emperors Baſil and Conſtantine to come, and reſtore the throne of the Cæſars in Rome. This unhappy city knew not truly what ſhe was, nor to whom ſhe belonged. The conſul Creſcentius and the ſenate were for reſtoring the antient republic: the pope was in fact neither for having a republic, nor a maſter: Otho II. was reſolved to reign deſpotic. He entered Rome and invited the principal ſenators and followers of Creſcentius to an entertainment, where, if we believe Godfrey of Viterbo, he cauſed them all to be put to the ſword. Thus was the pope delivered by the hands of his enemy from the ſenators of the republican party. But he wanted beſides to get rid of the tyrant himſelf; and, as if the troops of the emperor of the Eaſt, which filled all the neighbourhood of Rome, were not ſufficient, the pope called in the Saracens likewiſe. If the maſſacre of the ſenators at this bloody banquet, ſuch as it is related by Godfrey, be true, it was doubtleſs much better to have Mahometans for protectors, than this cruel Saxon for a maſter. After being beat ſeveral times by the Greeks and Mahometans, he

was

was at length made priſoner, but contrived means of eſcaping; and, taking advantage of the diviſions which ſubſiſted among his enemies, he again entered Rome, where he died in 983.

After his death, the conſul Creſcentius maintained for a little time the ſhadow of the Roman republic. He drove Gregory V. nephew to Otho III. from the papal chair: but at length Rome was again beſieged and taken, and Creſcentius, who ſuffered himſelf to be drawn from his place of ſecurity in the caſtle of St. Angelo by the hopes of an accommodation, and on the faith of the emperor's ſolemn promiſe, had his head ſtruck off, after which his body was hung up by the heels; and the new pope, elected by the people of Rome, under the name of John XV. had his eyes put out, and his noſe cut off, and in this condition was thrown from the top of the caſtle of St. Angelo into the market-place.

The people of Rome then renewed to Otho III. the oaths they had ſworn to Otho I. and to Charlemagne; and the new emperor on his ſide made an aſſignment of the lands in the Marche of Ancona to the popes, to ſupport their dignity.

After the death of the three Othos, the ſtruggle for the German ſovereignty and the liberty of Italy remained for a long time on the ſame footing. Under the emperors Henry II. of Bavaria, and Conrad II. named the Salic, whenever the emperor was employed in Germany, a party was formed in Italy. Henry II. like the Othos, immediately tranſported himſelf thither, to diſperſe factions, to confirm the popes in the donations they had received from former emperors, and to receive the ſame homage. In the mean time, however, the papal ſee was put up to the higheſt bidder, as well as all the other biſhoprics.

Benedict VIII. and John XIX. purchaſed it publicly one after the other. They were brothers of the family of the marquis of Tuſcany, which had always bore a great ſway in Rome, ſince the time of Marozia, and the two Theodoras.

After

After their deaths, in order to perpetuate the pontifical dignity in their family, the ſuffrages were purchaſed for a child of twelve years old. This was Benedict IX. who had the biſhopric of Rome in the ſame manner as we at preſent ſee a number of families privately purchaſe benefices for their children. 1034

This irregularity had no bounds; for in the pontificate of this Benedict IX. there were two other popes elected by dint of money; and thus there were ſeen three popes at the ſame time in Rome, excommunicating each other: but by a happy agreement theſe ſeeds of a civil war were ſtifled in their beginning; and the three pontiffs mutually conſented to divide the revenues of the church between them, and to live in peace, each with his miſtreſs.

This pacific, and very extraordinary triumvirate, laſted no longer than there was money to be had; and at length, when that began to fall ſhort, each ſold his ſhare of the pontificate to Gratian, a deacon, a man of quality, and very rich. But as young Benedict had been elected a long time before the other two, they left him, by a ſolemn agreement, the enjoyment of the tributes paid by England to Rome, called Peter's Pence, to which a Daniſh king of England, named Etelvolft, Edelvoft, or Ethelwulph, had ſubmitted himſelf and kingdom, in 852.

This Gratian, who aſſumed the name of Gregory VI. was in peaceable poſſeſſion of the pontificate, when the emperor Henry III. ſon to Conrad II. called the Salic, came to Rome.

Never did any emperor exerciſe a fuller authority. He baniſhed Gregory VI. and named for pope one Suiger, his chancellor, biſhop of Bamberg, without any one daring to murmur at it.

After the death of this German, who, in the liſt of popes, is called Clement II. the emperor, who was then in Germany, made Pope, a Bavarian, in his room. This is the Damaſus II. who went with the emperor's brief to Rome, where he was inſtalled, notwithſtanding all the efforts of this Benedict IX. 1048

who

who wanted to get again into the chair, after having ſold it a little before.

This Bavarian living but three and twenty days after his inſtallation, the emperor gave the papacy to his couſin Bruno, of the family of Lorraine, whom he tranſlated from the ſee of Toul to that of Rome, by his abſolute authority. Had the emperors kept this authority, the popes would have been no better than their chaplains, and Italy an enſlaved country.

This pontiff, who took the name of Leo IX. and has been ranked in the number of ſaints, will be ſoon ſeen at the head of an army fighting againſt the Norman princes, founders of the kingdom of Naples, and falling into their hands a captive.

Could the emperors have fixed their reſidence at Rome, we may ſee that, by the weakneſs of the Romans, the diviſions in Italy, and the greatneſs of the German power, they muſt have always been maſters of the popes; and that there would in effect have been a Roman empire. But theſe elective kings of Germany could not fix at Rome, at ſuch a diſtance from the other princes of Germany, who were become too formidable to their ſovereigns; the neighbouring ſtates being always ready to invade the frontiers, which made it neceſſary to take arms at different times againſt the Danes, the Poles, and the Hungarians. This it was that ſaved Italy for ſome time from a yoke, which ſhe would otherwiſe in vain have attempted to reſiſt.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of FRANCE, in the Time of HUGH CAPET.

WHILE Germany thus began to put on a new form of government, and Rome and Italy were without any, France became like Germany, a government entirely feudal.

This kingdom extended from the countries about the Scheld and the Maeſe, to the Engliſh channel, and from the

the Pyrenean mountains to the Rhone; theſe were at that time its bounds; for though ſo many hiſtorians pretend, that this great fief extended beyond the Pyrenees, as far as the Ebro, it does not at all appear, that the Spaniards of thoſe provinces, lying between the Ebro and the Pyrenees, were ſubject to the feeble government of France, at the time they were fighting againſt the Moors.

France, in which neither Provence nor Dauphiny were included, was a kingdom of a pretty large extent; but the king of France was far from being a powerful ſovereign. Lewis, the laſt of the deſcendants of Charlemagne, had no other demeſnes, but the cities of Laon and Soiſſons, and ſome few territories beſides, which were diſputed with him. The homage yielded by Normandy only ſerved to give the king of France a vaſſal, who was able to keep his maſter in pay. Each province had either its hereditary counts or dukes; he, who could only ſeize upon two or three ſmall villages, paid homage to the uſurper of a province; and he, who had only a caſtle, held of him, who had taken poſſeſſion of a town: all which produced a monſtrous aſſemblage of members, without any compact body.

Time and neceſſity eſtabliſhed as a cuſtom, that the lords or poſſeſſors of great fiefs ſhould march with troops to the aſſiſtance of the king. One lord owed him forty days ſervice, another twenty-five, and the under vaſſals marched at the orders of their immediate lords. But, if theſe lords ſerved the ſtate for a few days, they made war with one another almoſt the year round. In vain did the councils, which in theſe wicked times frequently made very juſt laws, enact, that no one ſhould fight from Thurſday till Monday at break of day, nor in Lent time, nor at other ſolemn ſeaſons. Theſe regulations, not being ſupported by any coercive power, proved of no effect. Every caſtle was the capital of a ſmall ſtate of banditti, and every monaſtery an armed garriſon. The advocates, whom they called Avoyers, and who were originally inſtituted to preſent their petitions to the prince, and manage their temporal affairs, were now the generals of their troops: the harveſts were either burnt,

cut

cut down before their time, or defended ſword in hand: the cities were reduced in a manner to deſarts, and the country depopulated by long famines.

One would imagine that a kingdom, thus left without a head, without government, and without order, muſt have fallen a prey to foreigners, but a like anarchy, which prevailed in thoſe times in almoſt every other kingdom, proved its ſecurity; and when, under the Othos Germany appeared the moſt to be dreaded, that kingdom was too much taken up with its own inteſtine broils, to think of foreign conqueſts.

From theſe barbarous times, we derive the cuſtom of paying homage for a houſe, or an hamlet, to the lord of another village. A lawyer, or a merchant, who is poſſeſſed of an antient fief, receives homage and fealty from another common man, or from a peer of the kingdom, who has purchaſed a meſne-tenure in his manor. The laws of fiefs no longer ſubſiſt, but the old cuſtom of fief-dependency, homages, and duties ſtill continue. It is a maxim in moſt courts of juſtice, that "there "is no land without its lord;" as if it was not ſufficient that it belonged to the ſtate.

When France, Italy, and Germany, were thus divided under an innumerable ſet of petty tyrants; the armies, whoſe chief ſtrength, under Charlemagne, as well as under the antient Romans, lay chiefly in the infantry, conſiſted now only of cavalry. There were no other troops but the *Gens d' Arms:* and the infantry were not allowed this name; becauſe, in compariſon with the horſemen, they were not armed.

The poſſeſſors of the ſmalleſt lordſhips never entered the field without as many horſemen as they could poſſibly bring: and their pride then conſiſted in keeping a number of ſquires, whom they called *Vaſſets*, from the term *Vaſſalet*, which ſignifies a petty vaſſal. The point of honour therefore was to fight on horſeback. They introduced the cuſtom of wearing a complete ſet of ſteel armour, which would have weighed a footman down to the ground; and the helmet and cuiraſs was a part of the dreſs. It is pretended that Charlemagne wore them; but

but they were not in common uſe till about the year one thouſand.

Whoever was rich came almoſt invulnerable to the field. This made the uſe of clubs more frequent than ever, with which they knocked down thoſe horſemen whoſe armour was proof againſt their ſpears. The chief trade then was in cuiraſſes, bucklers, and helmets, ornamented with plumes of feathers. The peaſants whom they dragged to the field, and who were alone left neglected and expoſed to danger, ſerved rather as pioneers than combatants. The horſes, much more regarded than them, were barbed, and had their heads covered with iron.

There were no other laws known then, but what were made by the moſt powerful for the ſervice of the fiefs. Every other object of diſtributive juſtice was left to the caprice of ſtewards, provoſts, and bailiffs, nominated by the poſſeſſors of lands.

The ſenates of thoſe towns, which under the Romans enjoyed a municipal authority, were almoſt every where aboliſhed. The title Senior, Signeur, (or Lord) for a long time peculiar to the principal ſenators of theſe towns, were now given only to the poſſeſſors of fiefs. The title of Peer began then to be firſt introduced into the Gallo-German tongue, which was then ſpoke in France. It was taken from the Latin word *par*, which ſignifies *equal*, or *fellow:* in which ſenſe only it was uſed under the firſt and ſecond race of the kings of France. The ſons of Lewis the Debonnaire ſtiled each other *pares* in one of their interviews, in the year 851. And, a long time before, Dagobert had given the title Peer to the monks. Godegrand, biſhop of Metz, in the time of Charlemagne, calls the biſhops and abbots Peers, as remarks the learned du Cangé. The vaſſals of the ſame lords, then, were wont to call each other *Peers*.

Alfred the Great had eſtabliſhed juries in England. Theſe were peers in each profeſſion. Any perſon criminally arraigned had a right of chuſing twelve men of his own profeſſion to be his judges. Some of the vaſſals in France adopted this cuſtom; but without limiting the number of peers to twelve. There were, in each fief,

as

as many as there were barons, who all held of the ſame lord, and who were peers among themſelves, but not peers of their feudal lord.

The princes therefore who paid an immediate homage to the crown, ſuch as the dukes of Guienne, Normandy, and Burgundy, and the counts of Flanders and Toulouſe, were in reality peers of France.

Of theſe Hugh Capet was not the leaſt powerful. He had for a long time been in poſſeſſion of the dukedom of France, which extended as far as Touraine. He was alſo count (or earl) of Paris; and the vaſt demeſnes he held in Picardy and Champagne gave him likewiſe a great authority in thoſe provinces. His brother had the territories which, at preſent, compoſe the dukedom of Burgundy. His grandfather Robert, and his uncle Eudes or Odo, had both of them worn the crown in the time of Charles the Simple. Hugh his father, ſurnamed Abbot on account of the abbeys of St. Denis, St. Martin de Tours, and St. Germain-des-prez, and a number of others which he poſſeſſed, had both ſhaken and governed France. It may therefore be ſaid, that, from the year 810, in which king Eudes began his reign, his family had held the reigns of government almoſt without interruption: and that, excepting Hugh the Abbot, who would not take the royal diadem, it forms a ſeries of ſovereigns for above 850 years; a filial deſcent ſcarcely known to any other king.

It is well known how Hugh Capet, duke of
987 France, and count of Paris, took the crown from duke Charles, uncle to the laſt king Lewis V. Had the ſuffrages been free, the blood of Charlemagne properly regarded, and the right of ſucceſſion as ſacred as it is at preſent, Charles would have been king of France *. He was not deprived of the rights of his anceſtors by a national parliament; but by that which makes and unmakes kings; force aſſiſted by prudence.

While

* Charles had rendered himſelf odious to all France by accepting the dutchy of Lorraine, on condition of paying homage for it to the German emperor Otho.

While Lewis, the laſt king of the Charlemagne blood, was upon the point of ending his obſcene life by a lingering diſeaſe, at the age of twenty-three, Hugh Capet aſſembled his forces; and, ſo far from having recourſe to the authority of a parliament, he, by his troops, diſperſed that which kept itſelf aſſembled at Compeigne; in order to ſecure the ſucceſſion to Charles. 987

This fact is ſufficiently authenticated by the letter wrote by Gerbert, afterwards archbiſhop of Rheims, and pope, under the name of Silveſter II. publiſhed by Ducheſne.

Charles, Duke of Brabant and Hainault, ſtates that compoſed the Lower Lorraine, ſunk under a rival more powerful and more fortunate than himſelf: and, being betrayed by the biſhop of Laon, and unexpectedly delivered up to Hugh Capet, he died a captive in the tower of Orleans, leaving two ſons behind him, who were incapable of revenging their father's wrongs; though one of them ſucceeded him in the Lower Lorraine. Theſe were the laſt princes of the male line of Charlemagne. Hugh Capet, thus raiſed to the throne by his peers, did not however gain an increaſe of territory.

CHAP. XXIX.

The STATE of FRANCE, in the Tenth and Eleventh CENTURIES.

FRANCE diſmembered lay languiſhing in her obſcure maladies, from the reign of Charles the Fat to that of Philip I. great grandſon to Hugh Capet; that is for near 250 years. We ſhall ſee if the Cruſades, which rendered the reign of Philip I. ſo famous about the end of the eleventh century, made that kingdom more happy or flouriſhing. But, during the ſpace of time of which I am ſpeaking, nothing prevailed but confuſion,

fuſion, tyranny, barbariſm, and poverty. Every lord of the leaſt conſideration coined money; but then any one could at will debaſe it. The fine manufactures were all confined to Greece and Italy; for the French could not imitate them in towns without privileges, and in a nation entirely diſunited.

Of all the events of thoſe times, the moſt worthy the attention of a member of community is the ex-
999 communication of king Robert. This prince had eſpouſed Bertha, his couſin in the fourth degree; a marriage in itſelf lawful, and, what is more, neceſſary to the well-being of the ſtate. We have, in our time, ſeen private perſons marrying their nieces, on paying the common price for diſpenſations from Rome; as if that ſee could have any right over marriages made at Paris. But this king of France did not meet with the ſame indulgence. The church of Rome, though loaded with infamy and ſcandal, had the boldneſs to impoſe a ſeven years penance on the king; ordered him to quit his wife; and excommunicated him in caſe of refuſal. All the biſhops who had aſſiſted at the ſolemnization of this marriage, were laid under an interdict by the pope, who ordered them to repair perſonally to Rome to aſk his pardon.

This appears an incredible ſtretch of audacity; but the ignorance and ſuperſtition of thoſe times might have ſuffered it; and a ſtroke of policy might have occaſioned it. Gregory V. who fulminated forth this excommunication, was by birth a German, and was governed by Gerbert, formerly archbiſhop of Rheims, and a declared enemy to the houſe of France. The emperor Otho III. who was no friend to Robert, aſſiſted in perſon at the council where the excommunication was pronounced. Therefore we may ſuppoſe, that reaſons of ſtate had as great a ſhare in this villanous proceeding, as bigotry and fanaticiſm.

Hiſtorians tell us, that this excommunication had ſuch an effect in France, that the king was abandoned by all his courtiers, and even by his own domeſtics; two ſervants only ſtaying with him; and theſe threw into the fire all the victuals he left at his meals; ſo fearful were

were they of even what had been touched by an excommunicated perſon. However low human reaſon might have been ſunk in thoſe times, one would hardly imagine, that folly and abſurdity could have been carried to ſuch lengths. The firſt author, who takes notice of this ſtupidity of the court of France, is cardinal Peter Damien, who wrote only ſixty-five years after this happened; and he relates that, as a puniſhment for this pretended inceſt, the queen was brought to bed of a monſter. However, there was nothing monſtrous in all this affair, but the inſolence of the pope, and the weakneſs of the king in putting away his wife.

Excommunications and interdicts are thunderbolts that never ſet a ſtate on fire but when they meet with combuſtible materials. There were none then; but perhaps Robert was afraid that ſome might be formed.

This mean compliance in king Robert ſo emboldened the popes, that they afterwards excommunicated his grandſon Philip I. as they had done him. The famous Gregory VII. firſt threatened to depoſe him, if he did not clear himſelf before his nuncios of a charge of ſimony brought againſt him; and another pope did actually excommunicate him. Philip had taken a diſlike to his wife, and entertained a paſſion for Bertrade, wife to the count of Anjou; he therefore made uſe of the laws to annul his marriage under pretence of kindred; and his miſtreſs got hers diſſolved on the ſame plea.

The king and his miſtreſs were, after this ſolemnity, eſpouſed by the biſhop of Bayeux. They were certainly culpable; but they at leaſt paid that reſpect to the laws, as to make uſe of them to cover their faults. However it be, one pope had excommunicated Robert for marrying his relation; and another excommunicated Philip for having put a relation away. But, what is ſtill more extraordinary, Urban II. who pronounced this ſentence, pronounced it in the very dominions of this king, viz. at Clermont in Auvergne, whither he had retired for ſhelter, and in the very council where we ſhall find him preaching the cruſade.

However

However it does not appear that Philip, tho' excommunicated, was held in horror by his ſubjects, which is another reaſon for calling in queſtion the general deſertion which they ſay befel king Robert on the like occaſion.

It is pretty remarkable, that king Henry, Philip's father, was married to a Muſcovite princeſs. The Muſcovites or Ruſſians began at that time to embrace Chriſtianity; but they had no commerce with the reſt of Europe. They inhabited the countries beyond Poland, which had yet ſcarce any knowledge of Chriſtianity, and held no commerce with France. However king Henry ſent into Ruſſia to demand the daughter of that prince, to whom the other emperors gave the title of duke, as well as to the chief of Poland. The Ruſſians called him, in their language, *Tzar*; from whence has been ſince formed the word *Czar*. It is pretended that Henry was determined to this marriage through the fear of having a church-diſpute upon his hands. Of all the ſuperſtitions of thoſe times, there was no one more deſtructive to the welfare of ſtates, than that of not being allowed to marry a relation in the ſeventh degree. Henry was related to almoſt all the ſovereigns of Europe. But in ſhort Anne, daughter to Jaraſlau, Czar of Muſcovy, was made queen of France; and it is to
1060 be obſerved, that after the death of her huſband ſhe did not enjoy the regency, nor ever made pretence to it. Laws change with the times. The count of Flanders, one of the vaſſals of the kingdom, was regent; and the queen dowager was afterwards married to a count of Crepi. All this would appear extraordinary now a-days, but it did not ſo then.

Neither Henry nor Philip I. did any thing remarkable; but, during their reign, their vaſſals, and under-vaſſals conquered kingdoms.

We ſhall now ſee in what manner a few adventurers of the province of Normandy without money, without lands, and almoſt without ſoldiers, founded the monarchy of the two Sicilies, which afterwards became ſuch a bone of contention between the emperors of the houſe of

of Suabia and the popes; the houſes of Anjou and Arragon, and thoſe of Auſtria and France.

CHAP. XXX.

The CONQUEST of NAPLES and SICILY, by a few NORMAN GENTLEMEN.

WHEN Charlemagne took the name of emperor, that title gave him nothing more than what he could ſecure by force of arms. He pretended to the lordſhip paramount of the dutchy of Benevento, which then compoſed a conſiderable part of the ſtates known at preſent by the name of the kingdom of Naples. The dukes of Benevento, more fortunate than the king of Lombardy, made head againſt him and his ſucceſſors. Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily were a prey to the incurſions of the Arabs. The Greek and Latin Emperors in vain diſputed between them the ſovereignty of thoſe countries. Several private lords ſhared the ſpoils of them with the Saracens. The inhabitants knew not who were their maſters; nor whether they were to be of the Greek or Roman communion, or Mahometans. The emperor Otho I. exerciſed authority in thoſe countries, as being the ſtrongeſt, and erected Padua into a principality. Otho II. not ſo fortunate as his predeceſſor, was defeated by the Greeks and Arabs, who united againſt him. The emperors of the Eaſt at that time remained in poſſeſſion of Apulia and Calabria, which they governed by a catapan. Certain lords had uſurped Salerno. The poſſeſſors of Benevento and Capua invaded, as often as they could, the territories of the catapan; who, in his turn, took every opportunity of ſtripping them. Naples and Gaieta were petty republics like thoſe of Sienna and Lucca; and the Mahometans, who were in poſſeſſion of ſeveral caſtles up and down, made depredations equally upon the Greeks and Latins. The churches of the provinces under the catapan were

ſubject

ſubject to the metropolitan of Conſtantinople, and the others to him of Rome. The manners took a tincture from this diverſity of people, governments, and religions, and the natural genius of the inhabitants no longer darted a ſingle ray. It no longer appeared like the place which had given birth to a Horace and a Cicero, and was afterwards to produce a Taſſo. Such was the ſituation of this fertile country in the tenth and eleventh centuries, from Gaieta and the Garillan, as far as Otranto.

The taſte for pilgrimages and adventures of knight-errantry prevailed in thoſe days. Times of anarchy produce the greateſt exceſs of heroiſm; its flight being more reſtrained in well regulated governments. Fifty or ſixty Frenchmen *, having ſet out for Normandy in 983, on a journey to Jeruſalem, returned by the ſea of Naples; and in their way arrived at Salerno at the time that this city, which had been beſieged by the Mahometans, had juſt purchaſed its deliverance with money. They found the inhabitants buſied in raiſing the ſum for their ranſom; and the conquerors in their camp given up in full ſecurity to brutal merriment and debauch. This handful of foreigners reproached the beſieged with the cowardice of their ſubmiſſion: and immediately marching with the greateſt boldneſs in the middle of the night, attended by a few of the inhabitants, who had courage enough to follow them, they fell upon the Saracen camp, ſtruck the enemy with a pannic, put them to flight, and obliged them to retire on board their ſhips: and this not only ſaved the riches of Salerno, but added to them the ſpoils of the enemy.

The prince of Salerno, ſtruck with their valour, would have loaded them with preſents, but found his aſtoniſhment encreaſed by their refuſal; they were however entertained a conſiderable time at Salerno, in a manner befitting heroes, who had been the deliverers of the

* Our author might have, with as good reaſon, called them Engliſh. They were no other than the offſpring of thoſe Danes, who had ſettled in Neuſtria, about ſixty years before this period.

the country; and at their departure they were obliged to promiſe that they would return again. The honour gained by ſo extraordinary an exploit, quickly engaged other Normans to make a viſit to Salerno and Benevento: thus theſe people, by little and little, reſumed their forefather's habit of croſſing the ſeas, to ſeek for warlike employments, and enliſted ſometimes in the ſervice of the Greek emperors, ſometimes in that of the princes of the country, and ſometimes in that of the pope; it mattered not with them for whom they ſignalized themſelves, provided they reaped they fruits of their toils. There aroſe a duke of Naples, who had enſlaved the riſing republic. This duke thought himſelf happy to make an alliance with this ſmall number of Normans, who aſſiſted him againſt the duke of Benevento. They afterwards, in the year 1030, founded the city of Averſa between theſe two dukedoms; and this was the firſt ſovereignty they acquired by their valour.

A ſhort time after arrived three ſons of Tancred of Hauteville, in the territory of Coutance, William, ſurnamed Fier-à-bras, Drogo, and Humphrey. Nothing more ſtrongly reſembles the fabulous times. Theſe three brothers, together with the Normans of Averſa, accompany the captain into Sicily. William Fier-à-bras kills a general of the Arabs, turns the victory in favour of the Greeks, and Sicily would again have been theirs, had they not proved ungrateful. But the catapan, beginning to fear theſe Frenchmen, who had been his defenders, was guilty of ſeveral acts of injuſtice towards them, which drew upon him their vengeance; they now turned their arms againſt him, for whom they had ſo lately fought; and three or four hundred Normans make themſelves maſters of all Apulia. This fact ſeems almoſt incredible; but the adventurers of the country joined them, and ſoon became good ſoldiers under ſuch maſters; and thoſe Calabrians, who ſought their fortunes by their courage, quickly became ſo many Normans. William Fier-à-bras made himſelf count of Apulia, without conſulting either the emperor, the pope, or the neighbouring lords, only his ſoldiers, as have done all the firſt kings of all countries. 1041

countries. Each Norman captain had a town or a village given him for his ſhare.

Fier-à-bras dying, his brother Drogo is cho-
1046 ſen ſovereign of Apulia in his room. Upon which Robert Guiſcard, and his two younger brothers, leave Coutance, to have their ſhare in ſo much good fortune. Old Tancred is aſtoniſhed to ſee himſelf the father of a race of conquerors: and the Norman name ſtrikes terror into the neighbouring ſtates of Apulia, and even into the popes themſelves. Robert Guiſcard, and his brothers, followed by a train of their countrymen, go in ſmall troops on a pilgrimage to Rome, and, marching thro' the countries with their ſtaves in their hands, at length arrive undiſcovered in Apulia.

The emperor Henry III. though ſtrong enough at that time to hold the Romans in ſubjection, was too weak to make head againſt theſe conquerors; and there-
1047 fore by a ſolemn agreement, he inveſted them with thoſe territories, which they had acquired by invaſion. They were at that time in poſſeſſion of all Apulia, the earldom of Averſa, and one-half of the dukedom of Benevento.

Soon after we ſee this family raiſed to be a royal houſe, and founder of the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, and a fief of the empire. How can it have happened, that this portion of the empire ſhould have been ſo ſoon rent from it, and become a fief to the ſee of Rome, at a time when the popes poſſeſſed hardly a foot of territory, were not even the maſters in Rome, nor ſo much as acknowledged in the march of Ancona, which had been given them by Otho the Great? This event is almoſt as aſtoniſhing as the conqueſts of the Norman gentlemen. But here follows the explanation of this ænigma. Pope Leo IX. wanted to get poſſeſſion of the town of Benevento, which belonged to the princes of the race of the kings of Lombardy, who had been diſpoſſeſſed by Charlemagne. The emperor Henry III. did
1053 in effect give him this town, in exchange for the fief of Bamberg in Germany; and the ſovereign pontiff is to this day in poſſeſſion of Benevento, in virtue of this donation. The new Norman princes were dangerous

dangerous enemies. There can be no conqueſts without acts of great injuſtice; theſe they committed, and the emperor wanted to have leſs formidable vaſſals. Leo IX. after having excommunicated them, took it in his head to march againſt them at the head of an army, with which Henry III. had furniſhed him, and give them battle. Hiſtory does not mention how the ſpoils were to be divided, it only takes notice of there being a numerous army, and that the pope further increaſed it by Italian troops, who inliſted themſelves as for a holy war, and that among the captives, there were a number of biſhops. The Normans, who had 1054 always conquered in ſmall numbers, were not a fourth part ſo ſtrong as the pope; but then they were accuſtomed to fighting. Robert Guiſcard, with his brothers Humphrey and Richard, count of Averſa, each at the head of a ſmall, but well diſciplined troop, cut the whole German army to pieces, and put the Italians to flight. The pope himſelf eſcaped to Civitade, a town near the field of battle; thither the Normans followed him, ſeized him, and carried him with them priſoner into that very town of Benevento, which had firſt given occaſion to this enterprize.

Pope Leo IX. has been made a ſaint: probably he might have done penance for having ſpilt ſo much blood to no purpoſe, and for having carried ſo many of the clergy into the field. It is certain that he did repent, eſpecially when he ſaw himſelf treated with ſo much reſpect by his conquerors, who yet reſolutely kept him priſoner for a whole year. They reſtored Benevento to the princes of Lombardy; and it was not till after the extinction of that family, that the popes at length got poſſeſſion of this town.

It may eaſily be conceived, that the Norman princes were more piqued againſt the emperor, who had furniſhed ſuch a powerful army for their deſtruction, than againſt the pope, who commanded it. They were now reſolved to free themſelves for ever from any pretenſions or rights, which either of the two emperors, between whom they were ſituated, might claim over them. Accordingly they continued to puſh their conqueſts, and

made themſelves maſters of Calabria and Capua, during the minority of Henry IV. and while the Greek empire was in a ſtate ſtill more feeble than that of a minority.

The conqueſt of Calabria was made by the ſons of Tancred of Hauteville, and that of Capua by the deſcendants of its firſt deliverers. Theſe two victorious governments had none of thoſe quarrels which ſo frequently divide the victors, and leſſen their power. The uſe of hiſtory obliges me to ſtop a little here, to take notice, that Richard of Averſa, who conquered Capua, cauſed himſelf to be crowned with the ſame ceremonies of conſecration, and the holy oil, that had been made uſe of for Clovis. The dukes of Benevento were always conſecrated in the ſame manner; and the ſucceſſors of Richard did the like. Which ſhews, beyond contradiction, that every one eſtabliſhes cuſtoms as he pleaſes.

Robert Guiſcard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and Richard, count of Averſa and Capua, both ſo by right of conqueſt, and both determined to be independent of the two emperors, made uſe of the ſame precaution, in regard to their ſovereignties, which ſeveral private perſons did in thoſe times of confuſion and rapine, for their patrimonial poſſeſſions: they gave them to the church, under the name of an offering, *Oblata*, and continued in poſſeſſion of them, on paying a ſlight acknowledgment. This was the only reſource left the weaker party in the unſettled governments of Italy; and the Normans, though ſufficiently powerful, made uſe of it as a ſafeguard againſt the emperors, who might in time become more powerful. Robert Guiſcard, and his brother Richard of Capua, when excommunicated by pope Leo IX. kept him priſoner. The ſame conquerors excommunicated by Nicholas II. paid him ho-
1059 mage, and put under the protection of the church, not only all that they had actually taken, but whatever they might take in time to come. Duke Robert did homage for Sicily, which he had not yet conquered, declared himſelf a feudatory of the ſee of Rome for all his dominions, promiſing to pay an acknowledgment of twelve deniers for each plough, which amounted

amounted to a conſiderable ſum. This homage was an act of political piety, ſomething like that of the Peter's pence paid by England to the ſee of Rome, or the two pounds weight of gold given by the firſt kings of Portugal, or in ſhort like the voluntary ſubmiſſion paid by many kingdoms to the authority of the church.

But, according to all the laws of feudal right eſtabliſhed in Europe, theſe princes, as vaſſals of the empire, could not chuſe a new lord paramount, without making themſelves guilty of rebellion towards the emperor, and putting it in his power to confiſcate their eſtates. The diſputes which happened between the church and the empire, and, what is more, the power of the Norman princes themſelves, put it out of the power of the emperors to exert their juſt rights. Theſe conquerors, in making themſelves vaſſals to the pope, became the protectors, and not unfrequently the maſters of their new lords. Duke Robert having received a ſtandard from the pope, and become the champion of that church whoſe enemy he had been, paſſed over to Sicily with his brother Roger, and conquered that iſland from the Greeks and Mahometans, who divided it at that time between them; theſe people ſubmitted, upon condition of enjoying their religion and cuſ- 1067
toms.

But there ſtill remained to be reduced all that part, which at preſent compoſes the kingdom of Naples; and there were ſtill reigning princes of Salerno, the deſcendants of thoſe who had firſt called the Normans into that country. Theſe the Normans at length drove out, and duke Robert made himſelf maſter of the city of Salerno; thus diſpoſſeſſed of their dominions, theſe princes took refuge in the Campagna di Roma, and put themſelves under the protection of pope Gregory VII. the ſame who made the emperors tremble by his great power. But Robert, this vaſſal and defender of the church, followed them thither; upon which Gregory VII. did not fail to thunder out his excommunications againſt him, which ended in the conqueſt of the whole territory of Benevento, of which Robert made himſelf

maſter, after the death of the laſt duke of the Lombard race.

1077 Gregory VII. whom we ſhall ſee ſo haughty and ſo dreadful to the emperors and kings, ſhewed nothing but the greateſt complaiſance towards the excommunicated Robert, to whom he gave abſolution, and from whom he received the town of Benevento, which has ever ſince continued in the ſee of Rome.

1084 In a ſhort time after broke out that great diſpute between the emperor Henry IV. and Gregory VII. of which we ſhall now give an account. Henry had made himſelf maſter of Rome, and held the pope beſieged in the caſtle of St. Angelo. Robert, who was then in Dalmatia, making new conqueſts, flew to the aſſiſtance of the holy father, whom he reſcued from the united powers of the Germans and Romans, made himſelf maſter of his perſon, and carried him to Salerno, where this pope, who had depoſed ſo many kings, died a priſoner, and under the protection of Norman gentlemen.

We muſt not be ſurpriſed at ſeeing ſo many kingdoms ſending forth knights errant, who became powerful ſovereigns by their exploits, and entered into the imperial families. This is preciſely what happened to Robert Guiſcard, and what we ſhall ſee more than once happen during the Cruſades. Robert married his daughter to Conſtantine, ſon of Michael Ducas, emperor of Conſtantinople. But this marriage did not prove happy; he had ſoon both his daughter and ſon-in-law to revenge, and determined to go and dethrone the emperor of the Eaſt, after having humbled him of the Weſt.

The court of Conſtantinople was but one continued tempeſt. Michael Ducas was driven from the throne by Nicephorus, ſurnamed Botoniatus. Robert's ſon-in-law was made an eunuch, and at length Alexius Comnenus, who afterwards ſuffered ſo much by the Cruſades, mounted the throne. Robert, during theſe troubles, was already advancing through Dalmatia and Macedonia, and carried terror and diſmay to the very gates

gates of Conſtantinople. Bohemond, his ſon by a firſt marriage, who was afterwards ſo famous in the Cruſades, accompanied him to the conqueſt of that empire. We may ſee by this, how much Alexius Comnenus had reaſon to fear the Cruſaders, ſince Bohemond began by attempting to dethrone him. 1084

The death of Robert, which happened in the iſland of Corfu, put a period to his enterprizes. The princeſs Anna Comnena, daughter to the emperor Alexius, and who wrote part of the hiſtory of thoſe times, looks upon Robert as no better than a public robber, and is greatly incenſed at his inſolence, in preſuming to marry his daughter to the ſon of an emperor; but ſhe ought to have conſidered that the hiſtory of the empire itſelf furniſhes examples of much more conſiderable viciſſitudes of fortune; and that every thing in this world yields to ſtrength and power. 1085

CHAP. XXXI.

Of SICILY in particular, and of the Right of Legation in that Iſland.

THE deſign of making the conqueſt of the Greek empire vaniſhed at the death of Robert; but his family ſecured their eſtabliſhments in Italy. Count Roger, his brother, remained maſter of Sicily; duke Roger, his ſon, continued in poſſeſſion of almoſt all the country now called by the name of the kingdom of Naples; and Bohemond, his other ſon, went and reduced Antioch, after a fruitleſs attempt to ſhare in the dominions of his brother duke Roger.

But why did neither count Roger, the ſovereign of Sicily, nor his nephew Roger, duke of Apulia, take the title of kings? There muſt be a time for all things. Robert Guiſcard, the firſt conqueror, had been inveſted as duke, by pope Nicholas II. His brother Roger had

likewiſe been inveſted by Robert Guiſcard, in quality of count of Sicily. All theſe ceremonies did however only confer titles, without adding any thing to their power. But the court of Sicily enjoyed a right which had been always kept up, and which no other ſovereign in Europe has ever had; he became a kind of ſecond pope, in his own iſland.

The popes had aſſumed a right of ſending legates to all the ſtates of Chriſtendom, whom they called legates à latere; theſe exerciſed juriſdiction over all the churches, exacting tithes, beſtowing benefices, and exerciſing and extending the pontifical power, as far as the circumſtances and intereſts of the potentates would admit. And temporal affairs being almoſt always connected with ſpiritual ones, they brought civil cauſes likewiſe before their tribunal; ſo that every thing, in which the church was the leaſt concerned, made a part of their department, as marriages, wills, promiſes by oath, and the like. They were indeed a kind of proconſuls, diſpatched by the eccleſiaſtical emperor over all the Weſt. By this means, Rome, always feeble, always plunged in anarchy, frequently enſlaved by the Germans, and a prey to every ſort of calamity, ſtill continued to be the miſtreſs of nations. Hence it is, that the hiſtory of each nation is always the hiſtory of Rome.

No ſooner had count Roger conquered Sicily from the Mahometans and Greeks, and ſettled the Latin church in that iſland, than pope Urban II. ſent a legate thither. This country indeed ſeemed of all others to ſtand the moſt in need of a legate to regulate the hierarchy, or church-government among the people, of which one half were Mahometans, and the other half of the Greek communion. And yet this was the only country where the right of legation was for ever aboliſhed. Count Roger, though a great benefactor to the Latin-church, to whom he reſtored Sicily, would not ſuffer a king to be ſent, under the title of legate, into a country which he had conquered.

Pope Urban, wholly intent upon the Cruſades, and deſirous to keep well with a family of heroes, ſo neceſſary to this grand enterprize, granted a bull to count Roger,

Roger, in 1098, the year before his death, by which he recalled his legate, and made Roger and his ſucceſſors natural legates of the ſee of Rome in the iſland of Sicily; inveſting them with all the rights, privileges, and authorities, belonging to that dignity, which was both ſpiritual and temporal. This is the famous privilege, which is called the monarchy of Sicily; that is to ſay, the privilege annexed to that monarchy; a privilege which the popes have ever ſince been for annulling, but which the kings of Sicily have always maintained. If this prerogative is incompatible with the Chriſtian hierarchy, it is evident that pope Urban had not the power of beſtowing it; but if it is only a matter of church-diſcipline, not repugnant to religion, it is as evident that every kingdom has a right to claim the ſame privilege to itſelf. This privilege is at the bottom only the right which Conſtantine, and all the emperors had, of preſiding over every part of the police of their own dominions; and yet in all the catholic countries of Europe, there was found but one Norman gentleman who had power and addreſs enough to procure himſelf this prerogative, and at the very gates of Rome.

The ſon of this count Roger ſucceeded to the whole patrimony of the Norman family, and was crowned and conſecrated king of Sicily and Apulia. 1130

Naples, which was at that time only a ſmall city, and did not then belong to him, could not give a name to the kingdom. This city had always preſerved itſelf in the form of a republic, under a duke who held in fee of the emperors of Conſtantinople, and who had found means, by well timed preſents, to preſerve his ſmall ſtate from the ambition of this conquering family.

The firſt king of Sicily, Roger, did homage for his kingdom to the ſee of Rome. There were at that time two popes; one called Anaclet, the ſon of a Jew, named Leo, and the ſame whom St. Bernard calls Judaicam Sobolem, of Jewiſh race: the other called Innocent II. Roger acknowledged Anaclet, becauſe the emperor Lotharius II. had acknowledged Innocent; and it was this Anaclet to whom he paid his empty homage.

The emperors looked upon the Norman conquerors as no other than uſurpers; accordingly St. Bernard, who was concerned in all the diſputes between the popes and the kings, wrote both againſt Roger, and this ſon of a Jew, who had got himſelf elected pope by dint of money. "One, ſays he, has uſurped the chair of St. "Peter, and the other the government of Sicily: it be-"longs to Cæſar to puniſh them."

Roger ſupported Anaclet, who was acknowledged in Rome. Lotharius laid hold on this opportunity, to ſtrip the Normans of a part of their conqueſts. He put himſelf at the head of an army, and, taking pope Innocent with him, directs his march towards Apulia. It is plain that the Normans had good reaſons for ſhaking off their dependence on the emperors, and placing a barrier betwixt them; for ſcarcely was Roger made king, when he found himſelf on the point of loſing every thing. He was beſieging Naples when the emperor marched againſt him. He loſt ſeveral battles, and almoſt all his provinces on the continent. Innocent II. purſued him in perſon, and with his excommunications.

1137 St. Bernard, who at that time accompanied the emperor and the pope, in vain laboured to bring about an accommodation. Roger every where beaten, retires into Sicily; the emperor dies, and every thing is changed; Roger and his ſon recover their provinces. Pope Innocent II. at length acknowledged in Rome, enters into a league with the princes to whom Lotharius had given the provinces he had taken from Roger, and, with an implacable enmity in his heart to that monarch; like Leo IX. he puts himſelf at the head of an army, and like him is defeated and taken priſoner. What was he to do in this ſituation? He did like the reſt of his predeceſſors; he granted abſolutions and inveſtitures, and applied for protection againſt the empire, to that ve y race of Normans, againſt whom he had before called in the aſſiſtance of the empire.

In a ſhort time after king Roger ſubdued Naples, and the reſt of the territories from Gaieta to Brindiſis, which were wanting to make his kingdom complete, and formed the monarchy ſuch as it now exiſts. Naples became

became the capital of his kingdom, and the arts began to revive a little in theſe beautiful provinces.

Having now ſeen in what manner a few gentlemen of Coutances, in Normandy, founded the kingdom of Naples and Sicily; we muſt next ſee how a duke of Normandy and peer of France, conquered England. Aſtoniſhing are the number of invaſions and emigrations which laſted from the fourth century to the beginning of the fourteenth, and which ended with the Cruſades! All the nations of Europe were intermixed, and there was hardly one which had not had its uſurpers.

CHAP. XXXII.

The CONQUEST of ENGLAND, by WILLIAM, duke of NORMANDY.

WHILE the children of Tancred of Hauteville founded kingdoms at ſuch a diſtance from their native land, the dukes acquired one, which became more conſiderable than that of the two Sicilies. Britain, in ſpite of the native bravery of her people, has been always deſtined to be governed by foreigners. After the death of Alfred *, which happened in 900, England ſunk again into barbariſm and anarchy. The antient Anglo-Saxons, its firſt conquerors, and the Danes its new uſurpers, were always diſputing the poſſeſſion, and freſh Daniſh pirates frequently came in alſo, to partake of the ſpoils of that unhappy iſland. Theſe pirates continued ſo formidable, and the Engliſh ſo weak, that in the year 1000, the latter were obliged to purchaſe their quiet of them for 48000 l. ſterling; and to raiſe this

* Alfred was ſucceeded by a ſeries of great princes, Edward, Athelſtan, Edmund, Edred, and Edgar, who governed the kingdom with equal capacity and ſucceſs. The confuſion did not begin till the reign of Ethelred, who aſcended the throne about fourſcore years after the death of Alfred.

this ſum a tax was impoſed, which laſted for a long time in England, as indeed moſt other taxes do, which generally continue to be levied long after the occaſion which gave riſe to them is ceaſed. This humbling tribute was called *Danegelt*, or Daniſh money.

Canute, king of Denmark, ſurnamed the Great, only for performing great acts of cruelty *, reduced both Denmark and England under his ſubjection in 1017. The native Engliſh were then treated like ſlaves; inſomuch that the hiſtorians of thoſe times acknowledge, that when an Engliſhman met a Dane, he was obliged to ſtop till the latter had paſſed by.

The race of Canute failing in 1041, the ſtates of the kingdom, reſuming their liberty, conferred the crown on Edward, a deſcendant from the antient Anglo-Saxon kings, who was called the ſaint and the confeſſor. One of the great faults, or great misfortunes of this king, was his having no children by his wife Edith, daughter to one of the moſt powerful noblemen of his kingdom. He hated his wife, as well as his own mother, and, for reaſons of ſtate, had them both removed from court. However, the barrenneſs of his marriage-bed proved the occaſion of his canonization; for it was pretended that he had made a vow of chaſtity; a raſh vow ſurely for a married man, and highly abſurd in a king, who ſtood in need of an heir to his dominions. But, by this vow, real or pretended, he forged new chains for his wretched country.

The cuſtoms and manners of thoſe times appear to have been abſolutely different from ours. William duke of Normandy, who conquered England, was ſo far from having any right to that kingdom, that he had not even any to Normandy, if birthright had taken place; for his father Robert, who was never married, had him by the daughter of a ſkinner of Falaiſe, whom Hiſtory

* Tho' Canute had ſhed an ocean of blood, and trampled under foot all laws divine and human, in making his way to the crown, he was no ſooner eſtabliſhed in the regal authority, than he ſeemed to change his diſpoſition, and became conſpicuous for his juſtice, piety, clemency, and moderation.

Hiſtory calls *Harlot*, a word which then ſignified, and and ſtill continues to ſignify in Engliſh, a common woman, a proſtitute. This baſtard, who was acknowledged in his father's life-time his lawful heir, maintained himſelf by his dexterity and valour, in the poſſeſſion of his dutchy, againſt all who attempted to diſpute it with him, and reigned peaceably in Normandy, and Brittany did him homage. Upon the death of Edward the Confeſſor, he had made pretenſions to the kingdom of England. There was no eſtabliſhed right of ſucceſſion * at that time in any one ſtate in Europe. The crown of Germany was elective, that of Spain divided between the Chriſtians and Moors; Lombardy was every day changing maſters; the race of Charlemagne, driven from the throne of France, was an example of what force can do againſt the right of blood. Edward the Confeſſor did not wear the crown by right of inheritance. Harold, who ſucceeded him, was not of his family, but came to the throne by the moſt inconteſtible of all rights, the ſuffrages of the people. The baſtard William could plead neither the right of election, nor that of inheritance, nor even any party in his favour in England. He pretended that in a former voyage he had made to this iſland, king Edward had made a will in his favour, which, however, no one had ever ſeen. He pretended moreover, that he had formerly delivered Harold from priſon, who had in return yielded up to him his right to the crown of England. Theſe weak reaſons he ſupported by a powerful army.

The Norman barons, aſſembled in form of a diet, refuſed to furniſh their duke with money towards carrying on this expedition, alledging, that if he ſhould not ſucceed, Normandy would be impoveriſhed; and that, if he did, it would become only a province to England: nevertheleſs, there were ſeveral Norman lords, who riſqued their fortunes with their duke. One ſingle nobleman, named Fitz-Othbern, or Fitz-Oſborn, equipped forty

* The right of ſucceſſion was generally eſtabliſhed all over Europe; though in ſome caſes it was prevented from taking effect, by the violence of uſurpation, againſt which no right or eſtabliſhment can avail.

forty veſſels at his own expence. The count of Flanders, father-in-law to the duke, aſſiſted him with a ſum of money, and the pope himſelf engaged in his intereſt, and excommunicated all thoſe who oppoſed his deſigns. At length he ſet out from St. Valeri with a numerous fleet, but the exact number of ſhips and ſoldiers is not known. He landed on the coaſt of Suſſex, the 14th of October, 1066, and ſoon after was fought in that country the famous battle of Haſtings, which alone decided the fate of England. The Engliſh, with king Harold at their head, and the Normans, commanded by their duke, engaged for twelve hours together. The cavalry, who fought in armour, and began to be looked upon every-where elſe as the chief ſtrength of an army, does not appear to have been made uſe of in this battle *. The chiefs fought on foot; king Harold and his two brothers were ſlain, and the conqueror marched to London, having a conſecrated banner, which he had received from the pope, carried before him. This banner was as a ſtandard, to which all the biſhops flocked, and declared unanimouſly in his favour. They came to the gates, attended by the magiſtrates of the city, and made him the tender of a crown, which they were not in a condition to refuſe to a conqueror.

William knew equally as well how to govern, as to conquer, and ſignalized his reign, by extinguiſhing rebellions, fruſtrating invaſions, and enacting and ſeverely executing rigorous laws. The antient Britons, the Danes, and Anglo-Saxons, lay now all confounded in the ſame ſtate of ſlavery. His brave Normans, who had aſſiſted him in his conqueſt, were rewarded by him with the lands of the conquered. Hence came that multitude of Norman families, whoſe deſcendants, or at leaſt their names, ſtill ſubſiſt in England. He cauſed an exact liſt to be taken of all the goods of his ſubjects, of what nature ſoever; and by this artful maangement, writers tell us, that he raiſed a revenue of 400,000l. of the then Engliſh ſterling money, which would make five

* The Engliſh hiſtorians affirm, that the Normans had a ſtrong body of cavalry, armed cap-a-pee; and that theſe in the purſuit made a terrible carnage.

five millions ſterling of the preſent money of that country, and about an hundred millions of our French livres. But it is plain that hiſtorians are greatly miſtaken in this account; for the revenue of England, which now includes Scotland and Ireland, does not all amount to ſo much, if we deduct what is levied for the payment of the national debt *: this however is certain, that William aboliſhed all the antient laws of the country, to make way for thoſe of Normandy. He moreover ordered that all pleadings ſhould be in the Norman language; and all the public acts continued to be iſſued in that language, till the time of Edward the third. William was reſolved that the language of the conquerors ſhould be that of the country, and ſchools for teaching the Norman tongue were eſtabliſhed in all the towns and villages. This language was a mixture of the French and Daniſh; which formed a barbarous dialect, that had not the leaſt advantage over that ſpoken in England. He is ſaid not only to have treated the conquered nation with ſeverity, but even affected a whimſical and capricious kind of tyranny;

* The ſtanding revenue is not ſo great, becauſe it is eſtabliſhed by a mild legiſlature, compoſed of the people themſelves; but, in caſes of emergency, the annual revenue has been raiſed to near five times the ſum. William, on the other hand, owned no reſtraint but his own will, and taxed the kingdom to the extent of its abilities. His revenue, excluſive of the old demeſne lands ſet apart for ſupplying his houſhold with all ſorts of proviſion, conſiſted in a land-tax, called danegelt, a quit-rent out of all the lands of England, wardſhips, reliefs, and fines, livery of hereditary lands, aſſignation of dower, licences of marriage, leave to ſue in the king's court, mulcts and forfeitures for marrying without licence, and other miſdemeanours, beſides the pecuniary penalties by which all ſorts of crimes were puniſhed; tolls and cuſtoms for paſſage, freedom of fairs and markets, protection, and liberty of buying and ſelling, duties laid upon merchandize, &c. Over and above theſe general branches, he received occaſional aids, due from the fees of thoſe who held of the crown by knight's ſervice; and occaſionally levied taillage upon focage tenants, and trading towns. His revenue amounted to four hundred thouſand pounds a year, every pound being equal to that weight of ſilver, conſequently the whole to be eſtimated at twelve hundred thouſand pounds of the preſent computation; a ſum which, conſidering the different value of money between that period and the preſent time, was equivalent to twelve millions of money of modern eſtimation.

tyranny; as an inſtance of which they alledge his law called the *curfeu* or *covre-feu*, by which he obliged the people, at the ſound of a bell, to put out the fires in their houſes, at eight o'clock in the evening. But this law was ſo far from being an act of tyranny, that it is an antient policy eſtabliſhed in almoſt all the cities in the North; and was for a long time obſerved in cloiſters. The houſes were all built of wood, and the fear of fire made it the principal concern of the magiſtracy to prevent, by all poſſible means, accidents of that kind.

He is likewiſe reproached with having deſtroyed all the villages within the compaſs of thirty miles, to make a foreſt, in which he might take the diverſion of hunting: but ſuch an action is too abſurd to be probable. Writers who relate this do not conſider, that it would require at leaſt twenty years to make a new plantation a proper place for hunting in. They tell us he planted this foreſt in 1080, when he was fifty-three years old. Now, is it probable that a man of any underſtanding ſhould, at ſuch an age, have deſtroyed ſo many villages, to ſow a tract of land, of thirty miles in length, with trees, in hopes of one day hunting in it. *

The conqueror of England became the terror of Philip I. king of France, who endeavoured too late to humble this powerful vaſſal; and fell upon Mayne, at that time dependent on the duchy of Normandy. William, upon the news of this, croſſed the ſea, recovered Mayne, and obliged Philip to ſue for peace.

The pretenſions of the church of Rome never ſhewed themſelves in a more ſingular manner than with regard to this prince. Pope Gregory VII. took advantage of the

† The hiſtorian does not conſider that there was no occaſion to plant; the whole country hereabout was naturally a foreſt; and William had nothing to do but to turn out the inhabitants and incloſe the ground. He depopulated the country in Hampſhire to the extent of thirty miles; and deſtroyed all the villages, houſes, and even churches, which ſtood in that tract; but he had no occaſion to plant even a ſingle tree.—With reſpect to the curfeu, it was doubtleſs an inſtitution in Normandy and other countries ruled by an arbitrary government: but not the leſs grievous to the free-born Engliſh.

the time in which he was engaged in a war with France, to require homage of him for the kingdom of England; founding his pretenſions on the antient *Peter's pence*, which had been paid by that kingdom to the church of Rome; amounting to about three livres of our money for each houſe, which had been always conſidered in England as a very bountiful donation, and at Rome as a tribute. William the Conqueror gave the pope to underſtand, that he might poſſibly continue this offering, but that, ſo far from paying him homage, he would forbid his people of England to acknowledge any other pope than whom he ſhould approve. Thus Gregory VII's propoſal became ridiculous by being too inſolent. This is the ſame Gregory who diſturbed all Europe with his attempts to raiſe the ſacerdotal dignity above the imperial one. But, before we come to ſpeak of this memorable diſpute, and of the cruſades, which had birth much about the ſame time, we muſt take a ſhort view of the other countries of Europe.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of the STATE of EUROPE, in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

RUSSIA had embraced Chriſtianity towards the end of the eighth century. At this time women ſeemed deſtined to convert kingdoms. A ſiſter of the emperors Baſil and Conſtantine, who was married to the father of that Czar Jaraſlau of whom I have already made mention, prevailed upon her huſband to receive baptiſm. The Ruſſians, always the ſlaves of their ſovereign, followed his example; but adopted only the ſuperſtitious part of the Greek ritual.

About that time likewiſe a woman brought over Poland to embrace Chriſtianity; Miciſlaus duke of Poland being converted by his wife, ſiſter to the duke of Bohemia. I have already obſerved, that the Bulgarians received the faith in the ſame manner. Giſella, ſiſter to the emperor Henry, alſo made her huſband, the king

king of Hungary, a Chriſtian in the firſt year of the eleventh century: ſo that it is an undoubted truth, that the one half of Europe is indebted to women for its knowledge of Chriſtianity.

The Swedes, who had received the goſpel as early as the ninth century, were relapſed into idolatry. Bohemia, and all the countries north of the Elbe, renounced Chriſtianity in 1013; and the inhabitants of all the Eaſt coaſt of the Baltic ſea were pagans. In 1047, the Hungarians returned again to idolatry. But all theſe nations were ſtill farther from being civilized than they were from being Chriſtians.

Sweden *, which probably had for a long time been exhauſted of its inhabitants by thoſe antient emigrations with which Europe had been over-run, appeared in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, to be wholly buried in barbariſm; without having war or commerce with its neighbours, and wholly unconcerned in any of the great events of the times; by which it was in all likelihood ſo much the happier.

Poland, much more barbarous than Chriſtian, preſerved till the thirteenth century all the cuſtoms of the antient Sarmatii; killing their children that were born with any imperfection, and the old men who were paſt their labour. From this we may form a judgment of the reſt of the North.

The empire of Conſtantinople was neither more nor leſs extended than we have ſeen it in the ninth century. It

* Sweden was firſt converted to Chriſtianity in the reign of Charlemagne, by one Hubert, who founded the church of Lincoping; and in the year 829, St. Anſcarius, a Frenchman, went thither, preached the Goſpel, and founded the church of Berken. King Olaus I. embraced the Chriſtian religion in the ninth century, and his ſubjects followed his example: but, a famine intervening, they imputed it to the change in their religion; returned to their idolatry, and ſacrificed the king himſelf to their idol Othinus. Eric VIII. ſurnamed the Liberal, was converted to the Chriſtian religion, and maſſacred by his ſubjects, whom he endeavoured to convert: but his ſon, Olaus II. completed the converſion of his people about the latter end of the tenth century, and even raiſed a tax for the pope againſt the infidels. Sweden, at this period, was by no means ſo obſcure as our author ſeems to imagine.

It defended itſelf in the Weſt againſt the Bulgarians, and in the Eaſt, the North, and the South, againſt the Turks and Arabs.

We have ſeen in general the ſtate of Italy. A certain number of great lords divided between them the whole country, from Rome to the Calabrian ſea; and the Normans had the greateſt part of the Eaſt. Florence, Milan, and Pavia, were governed by magiſtrates under the counts or dukes nominated by the emperors. Bologna indeed enjoyed a ſtate of greater freedom.

The houſe of Maurienne, from whence the dukes of Savoy, kings of Sardinia, are deſcended, began now to raiſe itſelf. It poſſeſſed, as a fief of the empire, the hereditary county of Savoy and Maurienne, ever ſince Humbert the *White-handed*, the ſtock of this family, had, in the year 888, obtained that ſmall detached portion of the kingdom of Burgundy.

The Swiſs and Griſons, likewiſe detached from the ſame kingdom, were under the government of bailiffs nominated by the emperors.

Two maritime cities of Italy began now to riſe, not by thoſe ſudden invaſions which have alone conſtituted the rights of almoſt all the princes who have paſſed in review before us; but by a wiſe induſtry, which afterwards degenerated into the ſpirit of conqueſt. Theſe two cities were Genoa and Venice. Genoa, which had been famous during the time of the Romans, conſidered Charlemagne as her reſtorer; that emperor having rebuilt the city ſome time after it had been deſtroyed by the Goths. It was governed by counts under Charlemagne and his firſt deſcendents; but, in the tenth century, was ſacked by the Mahometans, and almoſt all its citizens carried into ſlavery, But, being a trading port, it was quickly repeopled; and commerce, which had firſt made it flouriſh, ſerved to reeſtabliſh its former grandeur. It then became a republic, and took Corſica from the Arabians, who had made themſelves maſters of it. The pope exacted a tribute from that iſland, not only on account of being formerly in poſſeſſion of ſome patrimonies there, but as pretending to be lord paramount of all the kingdoms conquered from the infidels. The Genoeſe paid this

tribute

tribute at the beginning of the eleventh century, but ſoon after they freed themſelves from it under the pontificate of Lucius II. At length, their ambition encreaſing with their riches, from merchants they aimed at being conquerors.

The city of Venice, not by far ſo antient as Genoa, affected the empty honour of a more antient liberty, at the time they enjoyed the ſolid glory of a much ſuperior power. This was at firſt the retreat of a few fiſhermen and fugitives, who, in the beginning of the fifth century, had fled from the Goths when they ravaged all Italy. There was then no city, only a few cabins on the borders of the Rialto, the name of Venice being then unknown. This Rialto was ſo far from being free, that for upwards of thirty years it was a ſorry village belonging to the city of Padua, who governed it by conſuls. The viciſſitude of human affairs afterwards brought Padua under the dominion of Venice.

We have no proof that Venice enjoyed any acknowledged liberty under the kings of Lombardy. It is more probable that the inhabitants lay forgotten in their marſhes.

The Rialto and its ſmall neighbouring iſlands, did not begin to be governed by magiſtrates of their own till the year 709. They then became independent of Padua, and conſidered themſelves as a republic.

It was in the year 709 that they had their firſt doge, who was only a tribune of the people, elected by the citizens. There are many families ſtill ſubſiſting who gave their voice to the firſt doge. They are the moſt antient nobles in Europe, without excepting any; which proves, that nobility may be acquired without poſſeſſing a caſtle, or paying for patents to a ſovereign.

Heraclea was the firſt ſeat of this republic till the death of its firſt doge; and it was not till the end of the ninth century that theſe iſlanders, retiring farther into their warrens, gave to this aſſemblage of ſmall iſlands, which formed a town, the name of Venice, from the name of that coaſt, which was called *terræ Venetorum*. The inhabitants of theſe marſhes ſoon found it would be impoſſible to ſubſiſt without commerce: thus neceſſity proved the baſis of their grandeur. It is not yet certainly

tainly decided, whether this little republic was at that time entirely independent. We find Berenger, for ſome time acknowledged emperor in Italy, granting, in the year 950, licence to the Doge to coin money. And theſe doges were obliged to ſend annually to the emperors, by way of ſervice, a mantle of cloth of gold; but Otho III. in the year 998, excuſed them from paying this petty kind of tribute. But theſe ſlight marks of vaſſalage did not in the leaſt diminiſh the real power of Venice; for, while its people paid a mantle of cloth of gold to the emperors, they acquired, by their riches and their arms, the whole province of Iſtria, and almoſt all the coaſt of Dalmatia, Spalatro, Raguſa, and Narenza. Their doge, about the middle of the ninth century, took the title of duke of Dalmatia. But the republic was far leſs enriched by theſe conqueſts than by its trade, in which it even ſurpaſſed the Genoeſe; for, while the barons of Germany and France were building priſons and enſlaving the ſubject, Venice got their money by furniſhing them with all the commodities of the Eaſt. The Mediterranean was already covered with her ſhips, and ſhe grew rich and flouriſhing by the ignorance and barbariſm of the northern nations of Europe.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Of SPAIN and the MOORS.

The State of that Kingdom, till the beginning of the Twelfth Century.

SPAIN was ſtill divided between the Mahometans and Chriſtians; but the latter did not poſſeſs a fourth part, and even that the moſt barren corner of the whole country. The dominions of the Chriſtians were the Aſturias, the princes of which took the titles of kings of Leon; a part of Old Caſtile governed by counts; Barcelona, and one half of Catalonia alſo ſubject to counts; Navarre, which had a king, and a part of

of Arragon which had for ſome time been united to Navarre. The Moors poſſeſſed Portugal, Murcia, Andaluſia, Valentia, Grenada, Tortoſa, and a tract of country ſtretching into the midſt of the kingdom beyond the mountains of Caſtile and Sarragoſa. The Mooriſh kings always kept their reſidence at Cordova, where they had built that large moſque whoſe roof is ſupported by 365 columns of curious marble, and which the Chriſtians ſtill continue to call *la Moſquita*, i. e. the moſque, though now uſed as a cathedral.

Here the arts flouriſhed; and the court of the Mooriſh kings was the centre of gallantry, magnificence, and the choiceſt pleaſures. Tournaments and tiltings probably owed their invention to theſe Moors. They had alſo ſhows and theatres; which, rude as they were, ſerved at leaſt to ſhew that they were more civilized than the other nations round about them. Cordova was the only place in the Weſt where geometry, aſtronomy, chymiſtry, and phyſic, were cultivated. Sancho the Fat, king of Leon, was obliged to make a journey to Cordova in 956 to put himſelf under the care of a famous Arabian phyſician; who, invited by the king, reſolved that the king ſhould come to him.

Cordova is a moſt delightful country, watered by the Guadalquivir, and where groves of citrons, oranges, and pomegranates, perfume the air, and every thing invites to the ſofter pleaſures. Luxury and effeminacy at laſt corrupted the Mooriſh kings. Their dominions were in the tenth century like thoſe of almoſt all the Chriſtian princes, divided into petty ſtates. Toledo, Murcia, Valentia, and even Hueſca, had their kings. This was the only time for cruſhing this divided power; but the Chriſtians of Spain were ſtill more diſunited. They were perpetually at war among themſelves, joined together only to betray each other, and frequently even made alliances with the Moors. Alphonſo V. king of Leon, in the year 1000, gave his ſiſter Thereſa in marriage to Sultan Abdala, king of Toledo.

Jealouſies produce greater crimes among petty princes than among great ſovereigns. War alone is capable of deciding the fate of great empires, but ſurpriſals, treachery, aſſaſſinations, and poiſonings, are the more common

common weapons of rival neighbours, who having much ambition and few means of gratifying it, have recourſe to every art that can ſupply the place of ſtrength. Thus, at the end of the tenth century, Sancho Garcia, Count of Caſtile, poiſoned his own mother, and his ſon Don Garcia was ſtabbed by three noblemen of that country as he was going to be married.

In fine, in the year 1035, Ferdinand, ſon of Sancho king of Navarre and Arragon, re-united to his dominions Old Caſtile, which had devolved to his family by the murder of this Don Garcia, together with the kingdom of Leon, which he took from 1036 his brother-in-law, whom he ſlew in battle.

Caſtile then became a kingdom, and Leon one of its provinces. This ſame Ferdinand, not ſatisfied with having robbed his brother-in law of his crown and his life, took Navarre likewiſe from his own brother, whom he cauſed to be aſſaſſinated in a battle which he fought againſt him*. This is the Ferdinand on whom the Spaniards have beſtowed the name of Great, ſurely only to render infamous a title too often laviſhed on uſurpers and murderers.

His father Don Sancho, alſo ſurnamed the Great; for having ſucceeded to the counts of Caſtile, and having married one of his ſons to the princeſs of Aſturias, cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed emperor; upon which Ferdinand reſolved likewiſe to aſſume that title. It is certain that there neither is, nor ever can be, any title peculiar

* Our author ſeems to be remarkably incenſed againſt all the Spaniſh monarchs who rendered themſelves great by their victories over the Mahometans: and theſe laſt he extols, upon all occaſions, with a warmth that betrays an evident partiality. We know no author who ſays that Ferdinand cauſed his brother to be aſſaſſinated. In the hiſtory of Roderic de Toledo, in the chronicle of Luca Tudenſis, in Ferreras, Roderic Santius, Alphonſus a Carthagena, and other hiſtorians, we find that Ferdinand declined this battle, and ſent ambaſſadors to accommodate the diſputes between him and his brother: that he came into the field with great reluctance; and when his brother was ſlain in the courſe of the engagement, lamented his death with all the ſincerity of grief, and immediately put an end to the purſuit. M. de Voltaire ſeems to be ſo enamoured of the Muſſulmans in Barbary, that we ſhould not be ſurprized to hear that he had moved his reſidence from Lauſanne to Morocco.

culiar to ſovereigns but ſuch as they pleaſe to take themſelves, or that cuſtom gives them. The title of emperor every where ſignified the heir to the Cæſars, and maſters of the Roman empire, or at leaſt one who pretended to be ſo: it can hardly therefore be thought that this could be the diſtinguiſhing mark of a prince, whoſe power was but ill eſtabliſhed, and who governed only a fourth part of Spain.

The emperor Henry III. mortified the pride of this Caſtilian, by requiring him to do him homage for his ſmall dominions as a fief of the empire. It it difficult to ſay which of the two pretenſions was the moſt idle, that of the German emperor, or that of the Spaniard. Theſe empty notions however had no effect, for Ferdinand's dominions ſtill remained a little free kingdom.

In the reign of this Ferdinand lived Rodriguez or Roderic called *the Cid*, who actually married Chimene, whoſe father he had murdered. Thoſe, who know nothing of this hiſtory, but from the tragedy ſo famous in the laſt age, ſuppoſe that king Ferdinand was in poſſeſſion of Andaluſia.

The Cid began his famous exploits by aſſiſting Don Sancho, Ferdinand's eldeſt ſon to ſtrip his brothers and ſiſters of the inheritance left them by their father; but Sancho being murdered in one of theſe unjuſt
1073 expeditions, his brothers entered again into the poſſeſſion of their eſtates.

There were at that time near twenty kings in Spain, ſome Chriſtians, ſome Mahometans; and beſides theſe twenty kings, there were a conſiderable number of independent lords, who came on horſeback completely armed, and followed by ſeveral ſquires, to offer their ſervice to the princes and princeſſes who were engaged in wars. This cuſtom, which at that time obtained throughout all Europe, was no where held in greater credit than in Spain. The princes, with whom theſe knights engaged, girded them with a belt, and preſented them with a ſword, with which they gave them a ſlight blow on the ſhoulder. The Chriſtian knights added other ceremonies to their dubbing, in particular that of watching their arms all night before the altar of the Virgin.

Virgin. The Muſſulmans were content with girding on a ſcymetar. This was the origin of knights-errant, and of ſuch numbers of ſingle combats; the moſt celebrated of which was that, fought after the death of king Sancho, who was aſſaſſinated while he was beſieging his ſiſter Ouraca in the city Zamora. Three knights maintained the honour of the Infanta againſt Don Diego de Lara, by whom ſhe was accuſed. They fought by turns in a place railed in, and in preſence of judges appointed on either ſide. Don Diego overthrew and killed two of the Infanta's knights, and the horſe of the third, having the reins of his bridle cut, and running away with his maſter out of the liſts, the combat was adjudged to be undecided.

Of all this number of knights the Cid diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt againſt the Moors. Several knights ranged themſelves under his banner, and all together, with their ſquires and the horſemen, compoſed an army covered with iron, and mounted on the moſt beautiful ſteeds in the country. The Cid overcame ſeveral petty Mooriſh kings; and having at laſt fortified himſelf in the city of Alcaſſar, he there erected a little ſovereignty.

Afterwards he perſuaded his maſter Alphonſo VI. king of Old Caſtile, to undertake the ſiege of the city of Toledo, offering him the aſſiſtance of all his knights for that expedition. The noiſe of this ſiege, and the Cid's reputation, brought many knights and princes from France and Italy, particularly Raymond, count of Toulouſe, and two princes of the blood of France, of the branch of Burgundy. The Mooriſh king, named Hiaja, was the ſon of Almamon, one of the moſt generous princes recorded in hiſtory. This Almamon had given an aſylum in Toledo to this very king Alphonſo, when perſecuted by his brother Sancho. They had lived together for a long time in ſtrict friendſhip, and Almamon was ſo far from detaining him, when after the death of Sancho he became king, and conſequently more to be feared, that he gave him part of his treaſures; and it is ſaid that they both ſhed tears at their ſeparation. Several of the Mooriſh

princes went out of the city to reproach Alphonſo with his ingratitude towards his benefactor, and more than one remarkable combat was fought under the walls of Toledo.

This ſiege laſted a whole year, at the end
1085 of which Toledo capitulated, but on condition that the Moors ſhould be treated in the ſame manner as the Chriſtians had formerly been, and left to the free exerciſe of their religion and laws. A promiſe which was at firſt kept, but which time afterwards occaſioned to be broke. All New Caſtile at laſt yielded to the Cid, who took poſſeſſion of it in the name of Alphonſo, and Madrid, a ſmall place, that was one day to be the capital of Spain, came then for the firſt time into the hands of the Chriſtians.

Several families came from France to ſettle in Toledo, and had ſeveral privileges granted them, which are ſtill called in Spain the franchiſes. King Alphonſo, immediately upon the reduction of Toledo, called an aſſembly of biſhops, which, without the concurrence of the people, formerly thought neceſſary, promoted a prieſt, named Bernard, to the biſhopric of Toledo; and pope Gregory VII. at the king's requeſt, made him primate of Spain. The church reaped almoſt the whole advantage of this conqueſt; but the primate was imprudent enough to abuſe this, by violating the conditions which his maſter had granted to the Moors. By the articles of capitulation, the great moſque was to remain in poſſeſſion of the Mahometans; but the archbiſhop, in the king's abſence, converted it into a church; by which imprudent act he ſtirred up a rebellion againſt him. Alphonſo returns to Toledo, juſtly irritated againſt the prelate for his indiſcretion, appeaſes the tumult, and reſtores the moſque to the Moors, threatening at the ſame time to puniſh the archbiſhop; but privately prevailed upon the Mahometans to petition for his pardon, which was granted him at their requeſt: and thus the inſurrection was quelled, and every thing reſtored to order.

Alphonſo, either thro' policy or inclination, added to the dominions he had acquired by the valour of the Cid,

Cid, in marrying Zaid, daughter to Benedat, the new Mooriſh king of Andaluſia, with whom he received ſeveral towns in dowry.

He is reproached with having, in conjunction with his father-in-law, invited other Moors out of Africa into Spain. It is hardly to be ſuppoſed that he could have committed ſo great an error in politics; but indeed kings very often act contrary to all the rules of probability. Be it as it will, an army of Moors came over from Africa, and fell upon Spain, which encreaſed the general confuſion of that kingdom. The Miramolin, who governed Morocco, ſent his general Abenada to the aſſiſtance of the king of Andaluſia: but this general not only betrayed the prince to whom he was ſent, but likewiſe the Miramolin in whoſe name he came, who being at length enraged at his general's perfidy, came in perſon to give him battle, who was making war with the other Mahometans while the Chriſtians were as much divided among themſelves.

While Spain was thus torn to pieces by the Moors and Chriſtians, the Cid Don Rodriguez, at the head of his army of knights, ſubdued the kingdom of Valentia. There were at that time few kings in Spain ſo powerful as himſelf; but whether he preferred the title of Cid, or whether his ſpirit of knighthood kept him faithful to king Alphonſo his maſter, he never aſſumed the regal title: nevertheleſs, he governed Valentia with all the authority of a king, receiving ambaſſadors, and being treated with the higheſt reſpect by all nations. After his death, which happened in the year 1096, the kings of Caſtile and Arragon continued their wars againſt the Moors; and Spain was more drenched in blood than ever, and more deſolated: the ſad effects of the antient conſpiracy between archbiſhop Opas and Count Julian above 400 years before, which, a long time after, proved the ſource of numberleſs misfortunes to the kingdom of Spain.

CHAP. XXXV.

Of RELIGION and SUPERSTITION in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

HERESIES ſeem to be the fruit of a little knowledge and a little leiſure. We have already ſeen that the ſtate of the church in the tenth century ſcarcely permitted either leiſure or ſtudy. Every one was in arms, and the whole diſpute was about riches and power. Nevertheleſs, during the reign of Robert king of France, there were ſeveral prieſts of that kingdom, and among others one Stephen, confeſſor to queen Conſtance, accuſed of hereſy. Theſe people were ſtigmatized with the name of Manichæans, only to render them more odious; for neither they nor their judges could poſſibly underſtand any thing of the doctrine taught by the Perſian philoſopher Manes. They were probably a ſet of enthuſiaſts, who pretended to an extraordinary degree of perfection, in order to impoſe on the minds of the ignorant. This is the general character of the chiefs of all ſects. They were charged with horrible crimes and unnatural ſentiments, the common way of treating thoſe whoſe doctrines are
1028 not underſtood. They were formerly accuſed of repeating litanies in honour of evil ſpirits, with putting out the lights afterwards and then mingling together indifferently; with burning the firſt children they had by this inceſtuous commerce, and ſwallowing their aſhes. Theſe are much the ſame kind of calumnies which were caſt upon the firſt Chriſtians by the Pagans, and which I believe were founded on the manner in which ſome of them celebrated the Lord's Supper, by eating bread made in the form of a child to repreſent the body of our Saviour, as ſtill continues to be practiſed in ſome of the Greek churches.

The Heretics, of whom I am ſpeaking, were moreover principally accuſed of having taught, that God did not come down upon earth, that he was not born of a virgin, and that he neither died nor roſe again. If this is true, they were not Chriſtians; and indeed accuſations of this kind are generally found to contradict one another.

All that we can gather of certainty is, that king Robert and his queen Conſtantia went to Orleans, where ſome of the people called Manichæans had aſſembled themſelves, and that the biſhops cauſed thirteen of theſe poor wretches to be burnt alive: at which ſpectacle, ſo unworthy of their dignity, the king and queen are ſaid to have aſſiſted. Never before this execution was any put to death in France for preaching what they did not underſtand. It is true that, in the fourth century, Priſcillian was condemned to death with ſeven of his followers at Triers. But this city, which then made part of the two Gauls, has not been annexed to France ſince the declenſion of the houſe of Charlemagne. And let it be obſerved, that St. Martin of Tours would not communicate with thoſe biſhops who had ſought the blood of Priſcillian, declaring openly that it was a damnable action to condemn men to death for being miſtaken. But there was no St. Martin to be found in the time of king Robert.

After this there aroſe ſome ſlight diſputes about the Euchariſt; but theſe did not break out into any violent rupture. This ſubject, which ought to be only that of adoration and reſpectful ſilence, and not of perſecution and contention, eſcaped even the warm imaginations of the Greek Chriſtians; or perhaps was neglected, from its giving no ſcope to the metaphyſics cultivated by the Greek doctors after they had adopted the ideas of Plato. They had found ſufficient employ for this philoſophy in the explication of the Trinity, the conſubſtantiality of the Word, the union of the two natures and the two wills, and the abyſs of predeſtination. But the queſtions, whether the bread and wine are changed into the ſecond perſon of the Trinity, and conſequently into God? whether we eat and drink this ſecond perſon by

faith only? Theſe queſtions, I ſay, were of another kind, and did not appear to be ſubject to the philoſophy of thoſe times. Accordingly, in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, people contented themſelves with eating the Lord's Supper in the evening, and with communicating at the maſs under both kinds, without having any fixed and determinate ideas in relation to this myſtery.

It appears that in many churches, and particularly in England, they believed that they only eat and drank the body and blood of Chriſt ſpiritually. And in the Bodleian library there is a homily, wrote in the tenth century, in which are theſe words: "It is truly by conſecration the body and blood of Chriſt, not corporally but ſpiritually. The body in which Jeſus Chriſt ſuffered and the euchariſtical body, are entirely different. The firſt was compoſed of fleſh and bones, animated by a rational ſoul; but what we call the Euchariſt has neither blood, nor bones, nor ſoul. We ought then to underſtand it in a ſpiritual ſenſe."

Johannes Scotus, ſurnamed Erigenes, becauſe he came from Ireland, had long before maintained the ſame opinion, in the reign of Charles the Bald, and that too, as we are told, by the emperor's own orders.

In the time of this Scotus, or Scot, one Ratram, a monk of Corbie, and others, wrote on this myſtery in ſuch a manner as to leave room at leaſt to doubt, whether they believed in what has ſince been called the *real preſence*. For this Ratram, in his epiſtle addreſſed to the emperor Charles the Bald, ſays, in expreſs terms, "It is the body of Jeſus Chriſt which is ſeen, received, and eaten, not by the bodily ſenſes, but by the eyes of the minds of the faithful."

Others however wrote againſt them, and the moſt common opinion certainly was, that the true body of Jeſus Chriſt was eaten, ſince they diſputed in order to know whether it was digeſted and voided again.

At length Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, about the year 1050, both by his writings and from the pulpit, taught that the real body of Jeſus Chriſt was not, nor could

could poſſibly be under the appearances of bread and wine.

He affirmed that what would occaſion an indigeſtion if eaten in too great a quantity, could be no other than an aliment, or that what would cauſe drunkenneſs, when too freely drank, was a real liquor; that there was no whiteneſs in a thing that appeared white, nor roundneſs in an object that appeared round, &c. Theſe propoſitions of Berenger's could not fail of ſetting many againſt him, and the more ſo as his great reputation had raiſed him a number of enemies. The perſon who diſtinguiſhed himſelf moſt againſt him was Lanfranc of the Lombard race, born at Pavia, who was come to ſeek his fortune in France, and whoſe reputation was equal to that of Berenger. This is the method he made uſe of to confute his adverſary in his treatiſe *de corpore domini*.

"It may truly be affirmed, that the body of our Lord, in the Euchariſt, is the ſame as that which was brought forth by the Virgin; and that it is not the ſame: it is the ſame as to the eſſences and properties of real nature, and it is not the ſame as to the ſpecies of bread and wine; ſo that it is the ſame as to the ſubſtance, and it is not the ſame as to the form."

Lanfranc's opinion ſeems to be, in general, that of the whole church; Berenger had reaſoned only as a philoſopher. Here the queſtion was about a matter of faith, a myſtery which was acknowledged by the church as incomprehenſible. Now, Berenger was a member of the church, and therefore ought to have believed as ſhe did, and, like her, have ſubmitted to reaſon. However, he was condemned by the council of Paris the year 1050, and again at Rome in 1079, and obliged to pronounce his recantation; but this being forced, only ſerved to rivet his ſentiments more deeply in his heart, and he died in this opinion, which neither cauſed a ſchiſm nor a civil war. Temporalities alone were, at that time, the grand objects which employed the ambition of mankind, the other ſource, which was to produce the effuſion of ſo much blood, not having been yet opened.

We may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that the ignorance of thoſe times ſtrengthened the popular ſuperſtition. I ſhall relate ſome examples, which have long exerciſed human credulity. It is pretended, that the emperor Otho III. put his wife Mary of Arragon to death for being guilty of adultery. It is very poſſible, that a bigotted and cruel prince, ſuch as Otho III. is painted, might have puniſhed with death a wife leſs vicious than himſelf: but more than twenty authors have written, and Maimbourg has repeated after them, and others again after Maimbourg, that the empreſs, having made advances to a young Italian count, who rejected them from a principle of virtue, ſhe accuſed this count to the emperor her huſband of an attempt to ſeduce her, and he was puniſhed with death. Upon this, the count's widow, ſay they, came with her huſband's head in her hand to demand juſtice on the accuſer, and to prove his innocence. The heroic widow inſiſted upon being put to the trial of hot iron, and held in her hand an iron bar, red hot, as long as the judges thought proper; and this miracle, ſerving as a legal proof of the empreſs's guilt, ſhe was condemned to be burnt alive.

Maimbourg ſhould have conſidered, that this fable is related by authors, who wrote a long time after the death of Otho, and that they do not ſo much as give us the names of the Italian count, and of the widow, who handled a bar of red-hot iron with ſuch impunity. In ſhort, ſhould even cotemporary authors pretend to give authentic accounts of ſuch an event, they would not deſerve greater credit, than the wizards, who depoſe before a court of juſtice, that they have aſſiſted at the nocturnal meetings of witches.

The adventure of a bar of iron is alone ſufficient to diſcredit the puniſhment of Mary of Arragon, related in ſo many dictionaries and hiſtories, in which every page is a mixture of truth and falſhood.

The ſecond event is much of the ſame kind. It is pretended, that Henry II. ſucceſſor to Otho III. made trial of the fidelity of his wife Cunegunda, by making her walk bare-footed over nine ploughſhares heated red-hot.

hot. This ſtory, related in ſo many martyrologies, deſerves the ſame reply as that of Otho's wife.

Didier, Abbot of mount Caſſin, and ſeveral other writers, relate a fact nearly reſembling this. In 1063, the monks of Florence, diſpleaſed with their biſhop, went thro' the town and country crying, "Our biſhop is a Simoniſt, and a vile wretch;" and they had the boldneſs, ſays the Legend, to promiſe that they would make good their accuſation by ordeal trial. A day was ſet apart for this ceremony, which was on the Wedneſday in the firſt week of Lent. Two piles of wood were prepared, each ten feet in length, and five in breadth, ſeparated by a path a foot and a half broad, filled with dry wood. The two piles being lighted, and the wood in this ſpace reduced to coals, a monk, named Aldrobandin, paſſed through this path with a grave and ſolemn pace, and even returned half way back, to take from the midſt of the flames his cloak, which he had let fall. This has been related by many hiſtorians, and cannot be denied, without overturning the very foundations of hiſtory; but it is as certain, that we cannot give credit to it, without overturning the very foundations of reaſon.

It is, doubtleſs, very poſſible, that a man may paſs ſwiftly between two burning piles of wood, and even over hot embers, without being entirely burnt; but to go gravely backwards and forwards, to take up a cloak, is one of thoſe adventures of the *Golden Legend*, which ought no longer to be mentioned by men of common underſtanding.

The laſt proof I ſhall relate is that made uſe of in Spain, after the taking of Toledo, to prove whether they were to repeat the Roman Office, or that called the Moſarabic. It was at firſt agreed on all hands to terminate the diſpute by ſingle combat. Two champions, completely armed, fought according to all the rules of chivalry, and Don Ruis de Martanza, knight of the Moſarabic maſs-book, made his adverſary loſe his ſaddle, and threw him half dead to the ground. But the queen, who had a ſtrong inclination to the Roman Miſſal, reſolved that they ſhould make the trial of fire. All the

laws of chivalry were againſt it. However, the two maſs-books were thrown into the fire, where, moſt probably, they were both burnt; but the king, not to give umbrage to either party, ordered it ſo, that ſome churches pray'd according to the Romiſh Ritual, and others kept to the Moſarabic.

Whatever was moſt venerable and auguſt in religion, was debaſed throughout the whole Weſt, by the moſt ridiculous and abſurd cuſtoms. There was a feſtival of fools, and another of aſſes, obſerved in moſt of the churches. On theſe days they made a biſhop of the fools, and brought an aſs into the body of the church, dreſſed in a cope and bonnet.

The ceremonies obſerved at thoſe extravagant feſtivals, which continued to be in uſe in ſeveral dioceſſes for upwards of ſeven centuries, conſiſted in dancing in the church, feaſting upon the altars, and exhibiting the moſt obſcene and lewd farces. To conſider only the cuſtoms which I have here related, one would imagine, that one was reading a deſcription of Negroes and Hottentots; and indeed it muſt be confeſſed, that in many things we have been very little ſuperior to them.

The church of Rome has always condemned theſe barbarous cuſtoms, as well as the trials by ſingle combat and fire. And, notwithſtanding all the troubles and infamy which ſhe has had to encounter, ſhe has always preſerved a greater decency and gravity in her worſhip than any of the other churches; and has given proofs, that when in a ſtate of freedom, and under due regulation, ſhe was formed to give leſſons to all others *.

CHAP.

* The reader will obſerve that the author, in this place, ſpeaks as a perſon, who, bred up in the Romiſh faith, owes this compliment, even at the expence of his underſtanding, to the church of which he is a member.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Of the Empire of ITALY. Of the Emperor HENRY IV. and Pope GREGORY VII. Of ROME and the EMPIRE in the Eleventh Century.

IT is now time to return to the ruins of Rome, and that ſhadow of the throne of the Cæſars, which began to appear again in Germany.

It was yet uncertain who was to reign in Rome, or what was to be the fate of Italy. The German Emperors thought themſelves by right maſters of the whole weſtern empire: and yet they were ſcarcely ſovereigns in Germany, where the great feudal government of the lords and biſhops began to take deep root. The Norman princes, who had conquered Apulia and Calabria, formed a new power. The Venetians had, by their example, inſpired all the great towns of Italy with the love of liberty and independence. The popes were not yet ſovereigns, but wanted to be ſo.

The right of the emperors to nominate the popes began to be eſtabliſhed; but it is eaſy to ſee that the firſt favourable circumſtance might give a ſudden turn to affairs. This ſoon fell out under the minority of the emperor Henry IV. who was in the life-time of his father Henry III. acknowledged as his ſucceſſor. 1056

Even in the time of this laſt emperor the imperial authority began to decline in Italy. His ſiſter the counteſs or ducheſs of Tuſcany, mother to that true benefactreſs of the popes, the counteſs Matilda d'Eſte, contributed more than any one to ſtir up Italy againſt her brother. Together with the marquiſate of Mantua, ſhe poſſeſſed Tuſcany, and a part of Lombardy. Having had the imprudence to come to the German court, they detained her a conſiderable time priſoner there. Her daughter, the counteſs Matilda, inherited her ambition, and hatred to the imperial houſe.

During

During the minority of Henry IV. many popes were made by intrigues, money, and civil diſſentions. At length, in 1061, Alexander II. was elected, without the imperial court being at all conſulted. That court in vain nominated another pope: its intereſt was upon the decline in Italy; Alexander II. carried his point, and obliged his competitor to leave Rome.

Though Henry IV. when he came of age ſaw himſelf emperor of Italy and Germany, yet he was very much circumſcribed in his power. Part of the ſecular and eccleſiaſtical princes of his own country entered into cabals againſt him; and it is well known that he had no way of being maſter of Italy but at the head of a powerful army, and that he wanted. His power was trifling, but his courage was ſuperior to his fortune.

Some authors relate, that being accuſed in the diet of Wurtſburg of having intended to aſſaſſinate the Dukes of Suabia and Carinthia, he offered to fight
1073 the accuſer, who was only a ſimple gentleman. The day was fixed for the combat, and the accuſer not appearing, the emperor was acquitted.

As ſoon as the authority of a prince comes to be diſputed, an attack is generally made upon his morals. Henry was publicly reproached with having miſtreſſes, while the meaneſt prieſt was ſuffered to keep them with impunity. He wanted to be divorced from his wife, the daughter of a marquis of Ferrara, with whom he pretended he had never been able to conſummate his marriage. Some little irregularities of his youth contributed to ſour the minds of the people ſtill more, and his conduct had weakened his power.

There was at that time at Rome a monk of Cluni, lately made a cardinal, a man of a reſtleſs, fiery, and enterpriſing diſpoſition, and one who knew very well, upon occaſion, how to join artifice to an ardent zeal for the pretenſions of the church. Hildebrand was the name of this daring man, who afterwards came to be the famous pope Gregory VII. He was born at Soan, in Tuſcany,

Tuſcany, of obſcure parents *; was brought up at Rome, received into the order of the monks of Cluni, under the abbot Odilon; and, being deputed to Rome upon ſome affairs of his order, was afterwards employed by the popes in all affairs which required dexterity and reſolution; and began already to diſtinguiſh himſelf in Italy by an intrepid and violent zeal. The public voice declared him the ſucceſſor of Alexander II. under whoſe pontificate he governed every thing. The various characters, favourable and unfavourable, which ſo many writers have given us of this Gregory, may be found compriſed in a picture which a Neapolitan painter drew of him, in which he was repreſented with a ſheep-hook in one hand, and a whip in the other, trampling upon ſceptres; and by his ſide St. Peter's nets and fiſh.

Gregory engaged pope Alexander to ſtrike an unheard-of blow, in ſummoning young Henry to appear at Rome before the tribunal of the holy ſee. This was the firſt example of ſo ſignal an exploit; and in what times was it hazarded? When Rome had been accuſtomed by Henry III. the father of this very Henry, to receive her biſhops at the ſole command of the emperor. Now it was preciſely this mark of ſervitude which Gregory aimed at throwing off; and to prevent the emperors from giving laws in Rome, he reſolved that the pope ſhould give laws to the emperor. This bold ſtep was attended with no conſequence at that time. In all this affair Alexander II. ſeems like a forlorn hope diſpatched by Hildebrand, againſt the empire before he would venture to give it battle. The death of Alexander followed ſoon after this firſt act of hoſtility.

Upon the demiſe of this pontiff, Hildebrand had credit enough to get himſelf elected and 1074
inſtalled by the people of Rome, without waiting for the emperor's permiſſion. But he ſoon after obtained it, upon promiſing to be faithful to his intereſts; and Henry, accepting of his excuſes, ſent his chancellor to Italy to confirm his election at Rome. Upon this occaſion, the emperor being cautioned by his

* He was the ſon of a carpenter.

his courtiers to beware of Gregory, publicly declared that this pope could never be ungrateful to his benefactor; but no ſooner was Gregory ſettled in the papal chair, than he declared he would excommunicate all who ſhould receive benefices from laymen, and every layman who ſhould preſume for the future to confer them. He had formed a deſign of depriving all lay patrons of the right of preſentation to church livings. This was engaging the church in an open quarrel with the ſovereigns of all nations. The violent temper of this pontiff broke out at the ſame time againſt Philip I. king of France. The affair related to ſome Italian merchants who had been ranſomed by the French. The pope wrote a circular letter to the biſhops of France, in which he delivers himſelf thus: "Your king, ſays he, is rather a tyrant "than a king; he ſpends his days in infamy and vice;" and immediately upon theſe indiſcreet expreſſions follow the uſual threats of excommunication.

Not long after, while Henry was engaged in
1075 a war with the Saxons, the pope ſent two legates to him, with a ſummons to come and anſwer to the charge of having granted the inveſtiture of benefices, and threatning him with excommunication, in caſe of non-compliance. The two legates, who brought this ſtrange ſummons, delivered their meſſage juſt as the emperor had obtained a complete victory over the Saxons, and was returned crowned with glory, and grown more powerful than they expected. It is eaſy to conceive with what indignation a young emperor of five and twenty, victorious, and jealous of his dignity, muſt have received ſuch an embaſſy: yet he did not inflict any exemplary puniſhment upon the deputies; the prejudices of thoſe times not allowing of ſuch a ſtep; he contented himſelf therefore with treating this piece of inſolence with the contempt it deſerved, and
1076 left theſe indiſcreet legates to the inſults of the ſervants attending his court.

Almoſt at the ſame time this pope alſo excommunicated the Norman princes of Apulia and Calabria, (mentioned in the thirteenth chapter.) So many excommunications thrown out upon the back of one another would in

theſe

theſe times be looked upon as the height of folly and imprudence; but it ſhould be conſidered, that when Gregory iſſued his menaces againſt the king of France, he addreſſed his bull to the duke of Aquitaine, that king's vaſſal, who was nearly as powerful as the king himſelf; that when he broke out againſt the emperor, he had a part of Italy on his ſide, together with the counteſs Matilda, Rome, and one half of Germany; and that as to the Normans, they were then his declared enemies; ſo that, upon the whole, Gregory's behaviour will appear rather the effect of an inſolent and over-bearing temper, than of raſhneſs or folly. He was ſenſible that in endeavouring to ſet up his own dignity above that of the emperor, and all other crowned heads, he ſhould have all the other churches on his ſide, who would be proud of being members of a head who knew ſo well how to pull down every ſuperior power: and his deſign was not only to throw off the yoke of the emperors, but at the ſame time to bring Rome, the emperors and kings in general, under the papal dominion. This project was ſuch an one as might have coſt him his life, and he could expect no other; but the greater the danger the greater the glory.

Henry had too much buſineſs upon his hands in Germany to ſuffer him to go over to Italy; and his firſt ſtep ſeemed rather that of an Italian lord than an emperor of Germany. Inſtead of employing a general and an army, he is ſaid to have made uſe of a ruffian named Cencius, famous for his robberies, who ſeized upon the pope in the church of St. Mary Maggior, at the very time he was celebrating divine ſervice. Some reſolute fellows, his accomplices, gave the pontiff ſeveral wounds, and hurrying him away, ſhut him up in a tower of which Cencius had the poſſeſſion.

Henry acted more in the character of a prince, in calling a council at Worms, conſiſting of biſhops, abbots, and doctors, in which he depoſed the pope; and the ſentence was agreed to by all preſent, two only excepted. But this council wanted troops to make its deciſions reſpected at Rome. Henry only leſſened his authority by writing to the pope, that he had depoſed him, and to the

he people in Rome, forbidding them any longer to acknowledge Gregory as their pontiff.

As ſoon as the pope received theſe inſignificant letters, he addreſſed himſelf in theſe words to a council he ſummoned upon the occaſion: "In the name of almighty God, and by your authority, I prohibit Henry the ſon of our emperor Henry, from governing the Germanic kingdom, and Italy. I releaſe all chriſtians from their oath of allegiance to him; and ſtrictly forbid all perſons from ſerving or attending him as king." This is well known to be the firſt inſtance of a pope's pretending to deprive a ſovereign of his crown. We have already ſeen Lewis the Debonnaire depoſed by his biſhops: but there was at leaſt ſome colour for that ſtep. They condemned Lewis in appearance only to do public penance; and no one had, ever ſince the firſt founding of the church, preſumed to talk in the ſame ſtrain as Gregory. The circular letters written by this pontiff breathe the ſame ſpirit as his ſentence of depoſition. He there repeats ſeveral times, "That biſhops are ſuperior to kings, and made to judge them:" expreſſions alike artful and preſumptuous, and calculated for bringing in all the churchmen of the world to his ſtandard.

There is the greateſt probability that when Gregory thus depoſed his ſovereign only by pronouncing a few words, he knew very well that he had in his favour the civil wars of Germany, which began to break out anew with the greateſt fury. A biſhop of Utrecht, who had been greatly inſtrumental in Gregory's condemnation, coming to be ſtruck with a ſudden and painful illneſs, of which he died, repented, it is ſaid, upon his death-bed of what he had done, as an act of ſacrilege. This repentance of the biſhop, whether true or falſe, impoſed upon the people. Theſe were no longer the times when Germany was united under the Othos. Henry ſaw himſelf ſurrounded near Spires by the army of the confederates, who availed themſelves of the pope's bull. The feudal government which then prevailed in Germany, naturally produced ſuch kind of revolutions. Each German prince was jealous of the imperial power, as the higher nobility of France were of their king.

The

The flame of civil war ſtill lay ſmothering, and a bull properly darted was ſufficient to ſet it into a blaze.

The confederate princes granted Henry his liberty, only on condition that he ſhould live as a private perſon, and under ſentence of excommunication at Spires, without exerciſing any function either of a chriſtian or a king, till the pope came to preſide at a diet of princes and biſhops, to be aſſembled at Augſburg, and by whom he was to be tried.

It is certain that thoſe princes who had a right to chuſe the emperor, had a right to depoſe him; but to make the pope preſident of the council appointed for trying him, was in fact to acknowledge the pontiff as the ſupreme judge of both emperor and empire. This was the victory of Gregory and of the popedom; and Henry, reduced to theſe extremities, ſtill added to the triumph.

Willing to prevent this fatal trial at Augſburg, he took an unheard-of reſolution, in ſuddenly paſſing the Alps at Tirol, with a few domeſtics, to preſent himſelf to aſk abſolution of the pope. Gregory was then with the counteſs Matilda in the town of Canoſa, the antient Canuſium, on the Appennine mountains, near Rheggio, a fortreſs in theſe times deemed impregnable. This emperor, ſo celebrated for his victories, preſents himſelf at the gates of the fortreſs without either guards or attendants. They ſtopped him in the inner court, ſtripped him of his cloaths, and put him on an haircloth. In this condition, and barefooted, he was ſuffered to remain in the court, though it was then the month of January. They afterwards made 1077
him faſt three days before he was admitted to kiſs the pope's feet, who all that time was ſhut up with the counteſs Matilda, whoſe ſpiritual director he had long been. It is not at all ſurpriſing that this pope's enemies ſhould have reflected upon him for his conduct with regard to the counteſs. It is true he was an old man of ſeventy-two years of age; but then he was a ſpiritual director, and Matilda was a weak young woman. The devout language which we find in the pope's letters to this princeſs compared with the violence of

of his ambition, might tempt one to believe that he made uſe of religion for a maſk to all his paſſions; but, on the other hand, we have not a ſingle fact or circumſtance to authoriſe ſuch ſuſpicions. The hypocritical debauchee has neither the ſettled enthuſiaſm nor the intrepid zeal of Gregory, whoſe great auſterity made him ſo very dangerous.

At length the emperor was permitted to throw himſelf at the pontiff's feet, who deigned to grant him abſolution, but not till he had ſworn to wait for his ſolemn deciſion at the diet of Augſburg, and to be perfectly obedient to him in all things. Some biſhops and German lords of the emperor's party made the ſame ſubmiſſion. Gregory, then looking upon himſelf, and not without reaſon, as the lord and maſter of all the crowned heads of the earth, ſaid in ſeveral of his letters, "That it was his duty to pull down the pride of kings."

The people of Lombardy, who ſtill held out for the emperor, were ſo incenſed at his mean ſubmiſſion, that they were upon the point of deſerting him. Gregory was more hated by them than even in Germany. Happily for the emperor, their deteſtation of the pope's arrogance overbalanced their indignation at his meanneſs. Henry turned this to his advantage; and, by a change of fortune hitherto unknown to the German emperors, he met with a ſtrong party in Italy, when he was abandoned in Germany. All Lombardy took up arms againſt the pope, while he on his ſide was raiſing all Germany againſt the emperor.

On the one hand the pope made uſe of every art to get another emperor elected in Germany, and Henry left nothing undone to perſuade the Italians to chuſe another pope. The Germans choſe Rodolph,
1078 duke of Suabia; upon which Gregory wrote word, that he would determine between Henry and Rodolph, and give the crown to him who would ſhew the moſt ſubmiſſion to his authority. Henry however truſted more to his troops, than to the deciſion of the holy father; but meeting with ſome ill ſucceſſes, the pope growing more inſolent, excommunicated

ed him a ſecond time, in 1680. "I deprive Henry of his crown, ſays he, and beſtow the empire of Germany on Rodolph:" and to make the world believe that he really had the diſpoſal of empires, he made a preſent to Rodolph of a golden crown on which this verſe was engraved:

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho.

"The rock gave Peter the crown, and Peter gives it to Rodolph."

This verſe at once contains a wretched pun, and an affectation of haughtineſs, which were equally the taſte of thoſe times.

In the mean time Henry's party began to gather ſtrength in Germany; and this very prince, who, clad in haircloth and barefooted, had waited three days at the mercy of one whom he looked upon as his ſubject, now took two reſolutions which were more noble. One was to depoſe the pope, and the other to give battle to his competitor. Accordingly he aſſembled about twenty biſhops at Brixen, in the county of Tirol, who, acting at the ſame time for the prelates of Lombardy, proceeded to excommunicate and depoſe Gregory VII. "for being a ſupporter of tyrants, and an encourager of ſimony, ſacrilege, and magic." After this they proceeded to the election of a new pope, and choſe Guibert, archbiſhop of Ravenna; and, while this new pope haſtens into Lombardy, to ſtir up the people againſt Gregory, Henry, at the head of an army, marches againſt his rival Rodolph. Was it exceſs of enthuſiaſm, or what we call a pious fraud, that induced Gregory at that time to prophecy that Henry would be defeated and ſlain in this war? "I am not pope, ſays he, in his letter to the German biſhops of his party, if this does not fall out before St. Peter's day." Every one in his right ſenſes knows that none but a fool or an impoſtor would pretend to foretel what is to come: but let us conſider the errors which at that time had poſſeſſion of the minds of mankind. The learned in all ages have been addicted to judicial aſtrology. 1080

logy. Gregory was reproached with having put faith in the predictions of aſtrologers; and the act of depoſition made againſt him at Brixen ſays, "That he dealt in divinations, and interpreting dreams;" and on this foundation they accuſed him of magic: he has likewiſe been called an impoſtor, on account of his falſe and odd kind of prediction above-mentioned, whilſt perhaps he was at the worſt but a credulous man.

This prediction of his, however, fell upon his own creature Rodolph, whom he was ſo proud of having made an emperor, he being defeated, and afterwards ſlain by Godfrey of Bouillon, nephew to the
1082 counteſs Matilda, and the ſame who made the conqueſt of Jeruſalem. Who would imagine that the pope ſhould then, inſtead of making advances to Henry, write to the German biſhops, "That they ſhould proceed to the election of a new emperor, on condition of his yielding homage to the pope, and acknowledging himſelf his vaſſal?" Theſe letters plainly ſhew, that there was ſtill a very powerful party againſt Henry in Germany.

At this very time it was, that the pope ordered his legates in France to demand a yearly tribute of a ſilver denier for every houſe, in like manner as was done in England.

Spain was treated in a ſtill more deſpotic manner by him; for he pretended to be lord paramount of the whole kingdom, and ſays in his 16th epiſtle, "That it is much better it ſhould belong to the Saracens than not do homage to the holy ſee."

He wrote thus to Solomon, king of Hungary, a country which had at that time hardly embraced Chriſtianity: "You may learn from the elders of your country that the kingdom of Hungary belongs to the church of Rome."

Enterprizes of this nature, however raſh they may ſeem to us, are always the neceſſary conſequences of the reigning opinions of the times; and undoubtedly the ignorance which prevailed in theſe ages made it the general belief that the church was the miſtreſs of kingdoms,

or

or the pope would never have ventured to write always in this ſtile.

His inflexibility towards Henry was not likewiſe without foundation. He had gained ſuch an aſcendency over the counteſs Matilda, that ſhe made an authentic donation of her territories to the holy ſee, only reſerving the enjoyment of them for her natural life. It is not known whether this conceſſion was made by a public act, or by a private deed between the two parties. The cuſtom at that time was, when any one made a donation of their goods or territories to the church, to place a lump of earth upon the altar; and, inſtead of a deed, there were witneſſes preſent on both ſides. It is ſaid that Matilda made two ſeveral donations of her effects to the ſee of Rome.

The validity of this donation, confirmed afterwards by her will, was never diſputed by her nephew Henry, and ſtill remains the moſt authentic title of any claimed by the popes; but yet this very title proved a freſh ſubject of diſpute. The counteſs poſſeſſed Tuſcany, Mantua, Parma, Rheggio, Placentia, Ferrara, Modena, a part of Umbria, and the duchy of Spoleto, Verona, almoſt the whole of what is now called St. Peter's Patrimony, reaching from Viterbo as far as Orvieto, together with a part of the marche of Ancona.

Henry III. had given this marche of Ancona to the popes; but however this did not prevent the counteſs Matilda's mother from taking poſſeſſion of the towns, which ſhe thought of right belonged to her. It ſeems as if Matilda was deſirous of making reparation after her death for the injury ſhe had done to the holy ſee during her life time; but it was not in her power to give away the unalienable fiefs; and the emperors pretended that her whole patrimony was a fief belonging to the empire. Therefore this was in effect leaving territories to be conquered, and making a legacy of continual wars. Henry IV. as heir, and lord paramount, looked upon this donation as an abſolute violation of the rights of the empire: however, in the end, he was obliged to yield a part of thoſe territories to the holy ſee.

Henry,

Henry, ſtill continuing his vengeance,
1083 came at length before Rome, and laid ſiege to it; and made himſelf maſter of the part of the town on this ſide the Tiber, called the Leonina; but, while he was menacing the pope, he entered into a negociation with the citizens, and gained over the principal ones to his party by money. The people threw themſelves at Gregory's feet beſeeching him to avert the miſeries of a ſiege, by making conceſſions to the emperor. The intrepid pontiff replied, that the emperor muſt do penance once more, if he expected abſolution.

The ſiege proved a long one; for Henry could not carry it on conſtantly in perſon; being obliged to paſs over into Germany to put a ſtop to ſome inſurrections there: but at length he took the city by aſ-
1084 ſault. It is very ſingular, that the emperors had made themſelves ſo often maſters of Rome, and yet never choſe to reſide there. Gregory, however, was not yet taken, having retired into the caſtle of St. Angelo, from whence he defied and excommunicated his conqueror.

Rome ſmarted ſeverely for the reſoluteneſs of her pontiff. Robert Guiſcard, duke of Apulia, one of thoſe famous Normans of whom I have already ſpoken, took advantage of the emperor's abſence to come to the pope's relief; but at the ſame time he plundered Rome; and that unhappy city was ravaged at once by the imperial troops, who kept the pope beſieged, and by the Neapolitans, who came to deliver him. Gregory VII. died ſome time afterwards at Salerno, May 24, 1085, leaving behind him a memory dear and reſpected by the Roman clergy, who inherited his pride, but deteſted by the emperors, and by every good citizen who reflects upon the fatal effects of his inflexible ambition. The church, of whoſe cauſe he was at once the revenger and the victim, have placed him among their ſaints, in the ſame manner as the antient nations were wont to deify their protectors and defenders.

The counteſs Matilda, having loſt Gregory, ſoon after married the young prince Guelph, ſon to Guelph duke

duke of Bavaria: ſhe now ſaw all the folly of her late donation; ſhe was about forty-two years of age, and might yet have had children, who muſt have been left heirs to a civil war.

The death of Gregory did not however extinguiſh the flames which his ambition had raiſed. His ſucceſſors would not ſubmit their elections to the approbation of the emperors; the church being ſo far from thinking of paying homage, that ſhe exacted it of every one; and an emperor, when excommunicated, was no longer looked upon as a human being. A monk, abbot of mount Caſſin, was choſen ſucceſſor to the monk Hildebrand, and in every thing reſembled him, but his reign was very ſhort; and he was ſucceeded by Urban II. a Frenchman, born of mean extraction, who held the ſee for eleven years, and was another implacable enemy to the emperor.

It is clear to me, that the true foundation of theſe diſputes was, that the popes and Roman people were not for having any emperors of Rome; and the pretence they made uſe of, as an holy one, was, that the popes, as guardians of the rights of the church, could not ſuffer ſecular princes to perform the inveſtiture of biſhops with the croſier and ring. It is certain, that the biſhops were ſubject to their princes, and received their rights from them; and therefore owed them a homage for the territories they held by their bounty. The emperors and kings did not pretend to confer the gift of the holy ſpirit, but they expected homage from the temporalities they conferred. The formality of the croſier and ring was only an accidental part of the principal point; but it happened here, as it does in almoſt all diſputes, that the foundation was neglected, and they laid the whole ſtreſs upon an indifferent ceremony.

Henry IV. conſtantly excommunicated, and perſecuted on this pretence by every pope in his time, experienced all the miſeries that civil or religious wars could produce. Urban II. ſtirred up his own ſon Conrad againſt him, and, after the death of this unnatural ſon, his brother, who was afterwards Henry V. made

made war againſt his father. This was the ſecond time ſince Charlemagne, that the popes had armed the hands of children againſt their parents.

Henry IV. betrayed by his ſon Henry, as Lewis the Debonnaire had been by his children,
1106 was ſhut up in Mentz; whither two legates came from the pope to depoſe him; and two deputies, ſent from the diet by his ſon, diveſted him of the imperial robes.

Soon after having made his eſcape from priſon, he wandered up and down poor and friendleſs,
Aug. 7. and died at length at Liege, in a more miſerable and obſcure condition than his adverſary Gregory VII. after having ſo long attracted the eyes of all Europe by his victories, his grandeur, his misfortunes, his vices, and virtues. When he was upon his death-bed he cried out, "Juſt God, thou wilt revenge me on this parricide." It has been believed in all ages, that God hears the curſes of the dying, and eſpecially thoſe of parents: an error which would be uſeful and deſerving of reſpect, did it prove the means of putting a ſtop to crimes. But another error has prevailed more generally among us, namely, that of believing all excommunicated perſons to be damned. Henry's ſon put the finiſhing ſtroke to his unnatural hypocriſy and impiety, by cauſing his father's body, under a ſhocking pretence of religious ſcruples, to be taken out of the grave where it was buried, in the cathedral-church of Liege, and carried to a cave in Spires.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Of the Emperor HENRY V. and of ROME, 'till the Time of FREDERIC I. called BARBAROSSA.

THIS Henry V. who, armed with the pope's bull, had dethroned his father, and afterwards dug him out of his grave, maintained the ſame prerogatives

gatives as his father againſt the church, as ſoon as he came to be in poſſeſſion of the empire.

The popes had already found out the ſecret of ſheltering themſelves againſt the emperors under the kings of France. It is true, the pretenſions of the ſee of Rome ſtruck at the authority of all ſovereigns; but then the popes knew how to manage by treaties thoſe whom they inſulted by their bulls. The kings of France had no pretenſions upon Rome, and were only jealous of the Germans, who were their neighbours; this made them therefore natural allies to the popes. On this account, Paſchal II. went to France to implore the aſſiſtance of Philip I. in which he was afterwards imitated by many of his ſucceſſors. The pope, notwithſtanding the territories which the ſee of Rome poſſeſſed, the pretended donations of the emperors Pepin and Charlemagne, and the real one of the counteſs Matilda, was not yet become a powerful prince; almoſt every foot of the territories were either conteſted with him, or in the actual poſſeſſion of others. The emperor, not without reaſon, maintained that Matilda's territories ought to revert to him as a fief of the empire; ſo that the popes were engaged both in a ſpiritual and temporal quarrel. Paſchal II. could obtain nothing more of king Philip than a permiſſion to hold a council at Troyes, the 1107
French government being then too weak, and too much divided to aſſiſt him with troops.

Henry V. having, after a ſhort war, concluded a treaty with the Poles, found means to engage the princes of the empire in the ſupport of his rights; and thoſe very princes who had aſſiſted him to dethrone his father, in compliance with the pope's bulls, now joined with him to cauſe thoſe bulls to be annulled in Rome.

Upon this he paſſed the Alps with a power-
ful army; and Rome was once more drenched 1111
in blood for this quarrel of the croſier and the ring. Treaties, perjuries, excommunications, and murders, followed each other in rapid ſucceſſion. Paſchal having ſolemnly given up the inveſtitures in the emperor's favour and ratified it on the holy goſ-

pels, made the cardinals afterwards abrogate his oath, a new manner of breaking a promiſe; and ſuffered himſelf to be treated in full council as a coward, and a prevaricator, in order to be compelled to reſume what he had ſo ſolemnly given. This occaſioned the emperor to make a ſecond expedition againſt Rome; for the German Cæſars ſcarcely ever went thither but upon eccleſiaſtical diſputes, the principal of which was about the ceremony of the coronation. At length Henry V. after having created, depoſed, baniſhed, and recalled ſeveral popes, and having been as often excommunicated as his father, and like him diſturbed by his great vaſſals in Germany, was obliged
1122 to put an end to the war about inveſtitures, and give up the point of the croſier and the ring; and he gave up ſtill more; for, by a ſolemn act, he for ever renounced the right, which had been always claimed by the emperors and the kings of France, of nominating to vacant biſhoprics, or, at leaſt, of interpoſing their authority in ſuch manner at the elections, as made them abſolute maſters of the choice.

It was determined then in a council held at Rome, that kings ſhould no longer grant inveſtitures to thoſe canonically choſen, by giving a crooked ſtaff, but by a ring; and the acts of this council were ratified by the emperor in Germany, and thus finiſhed this bloody and ridiculous war. But the ſame time that the council decided ſo methodically the kind of ſtaff with which biſhoprics were to be granted, they took eſpecial care not to touch upon the queſtions, whether the emperor had a right to nominate to the ſee of Rome? whether the pope was his vaſſal? and whether the great poſſeſſions of the counteſs Matilda belonged to the church, or to the empire? It ſeemed as if they kept theſe in reſerve, as freſh fuel to a new war.

After the death of Henry V. who left no iſſue,
1125 the empire being ſtill elective, was conferred by the votes of the ten electors on a prince of the houſe of Saxony, named Lotharius II. There were much fewer intrigues and quarrels about the imperial throne than about the papal chair; for although in a council,

council, held by pope Nicholas II. in 1059, it had been decreed, that the pope ſhould be elected by the cardinal-biſhops, yet there had been no ſet form, nor certain rule eſtabliſhed as yet in theſe elections. This eſſential defect in the church-government was owing to an inſtitution in itſelf reſpectable. The primitive Chriſtians, who were all equally obſcure and united among themſelves, by the fear of the magiſtrates, governed in ſecret their humble and holy ſociety by a plurality of voices. Riches having in proceſs of time ſucceeded to their original indigence, nothing remained of the primitive church but this popular liberty, which ſometimes grew into licentiouſneſs. The cardinals, biſhops, prieſts, and clergy who compoſed the pope's council, had a great ſhare in the election; but the reſt of the clergy wanted likewiſe to enjoy their antient right; the people too looked upon their ſuffrages as neceſſary; and the emperors thought, that all theſe votes put together ſignified nothing without their aſſent.

Peter of Leon, grandſon of a wealthy Jew was elected by a faction, and Innocent II. by another. This occaſioned a new civil war; the Jew's ſon, as being the richeſt, kept poſſeſſion of Rome, and was protected by Roger king of Sicily*; his competitor being more artful, and more fortunate, was acknowledged in France and Germany. 1130

And here occurs an hiſtorical fact which is by no means to be paſſed over. This Innocent II. in order to gain the emperor's ſuffrage, yields to him and his children the uſufruct of all the territories of the late counteſs Matilda, by a deed dated the 13th of June 1133. At length Peter, whom they called the Jewiſh pope, dying, after a reign of eight years, Innocent II. remained in quiet poſſeſſion of the ſee of Rome; and there followed a truce of ſome years between the emperor and pontificate; the madneſs after cruſades, which was then at its height, drawing the minds of people another way.

* See Chap. xxxi.

Rome however was not yet quiet. The ancient love of liberty continued from time to time to ſhew itſelf: ſeveral cities of Italy had taken advantage of the troubles to form themſelves into republics; theſe were Florence, Sienne, Bologna, Milan, and Pavia. They had before their eyes the great examples of Genoa, Venice, and Piſa; and Rome ſtill remembered that ſhe had been the city of the great Scipios. The people reſtored the ſhadow of a ſenate, which the cardinals had aboliſhed, and created a patrician in the room of two conſuls. This new ſenate ſig-
1144 nified to pope Lucius II. that the ſovereignty reſided in the people of Rome; and that the biſhop ought to concern himſelf only about the church.

The members who compoſed this ſenate having entrenched themſelves in the capitol, pope Lucius beſieged them there in perſon; but was wounded in the head with a ſtone, of which he died in a few days.

At this time Arnold of Breſcia, one of thoſe enthuſiaſtic perſons who are dangerous to themſelves and to the reſt of mankind, went from town to town preaching againſt the exorbitant riches and luxury of the clergy: he at length came to Rome, where he found the minds of the people diſpoſed to liſten to him; he had conceived the idle notion of reforming the popes, and contributing to make the church of Rome free. Eugene III. formerly a monk of Citteaux, and of Clervaux, was at that time pope. To this pope St. Bernard thus writes: "Beware of the Romans, they are hateful to heaven and earth, impious towards God, and ſeditious among themſelves: jealous of their neighbours, and cruel towards ſtrangers: they love no one, nor are they beloved of any one; and, deſirous of making the world fear them, they are afraid of all the world, &c." If we compare theſe antitheſes of St. Bernard with the lives of many of the popes, we ſhall readily excuſe a people, who, bearing the name of Romans, endeavoured to have no maſter.

Pope Eugene III. had the addreſs to bring theſe people back to his yoke, who had been accuſtomed to that of ſo many others. But Arnold of Breſcia, in reward

reward for his preachings, was burnt at Rome during the papacy of Adrian IV. and thus met with the uſual fate of reformers, who have more indiſcretion than power.

I think I ought to obſerve, in this place, that Adrian IV. who was an Engliſhman by birth *, arrived at this pitch of grandeur from the moſt abject of all conditions. He was the ſon of a beggar, and had been a beggar himſelf, ſtrolling about from country to country before he could obtain favour to be received as a ſervant among the monks of Valence in Dauphiny; and from theſe low beginnings he raiſed himſelf to be pope.

Our ſentiments generally tally with our preſent fortunes. This Adrian was ſo much the more haughty as he aroſe from the moſt abject condition. The Romiſh church has always had the advantage of giving that to merit which in other countries is given only to birth; and it may even be obſerved, that thoſe among the popes who have ſhewn the moſt haughtineſs, were they who raiſed themſelves from the meaneſt beginnings. There are at preſent convents in Germany, where they admit none but perſons of noble birth: the Roman ſpirit has more grandeur, and leſs vanity.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Of Frederic Barbarossa.

AT that time reigned in Germany Frederic I. named Barbaroſſa, who was elected after the death of his uncle Conrad III. not 1152

* His real name was Nicholas Breakſpeare, born in the farm of Langley, belonging to the abbey of St. Alban's, in which his father was a ſervant and lay-brother. Nicholas, going to Arles in Provence, was admitted in quality of ſervant to the canons of St. Rufus, where he became a monk, and in the ſequel was raiſed to the rank of abbot, and general of the order.

only by the German electors, but by the Lombards likewiſe, who on this occaſion gave their votes. Frederic was a prince in all reſpects equal to Otho and Charlemagne. He was obliged to go to Rome to take the imperial crown, which the popes beſtowed both with haughtineſs and regret, wanting to crown him as a vaſſal, and vexed to receive him as a maſter. This ambiguous ſituation of the popes, the emperors, the Roman people, and the principal towns of Italy, always occaſioned the effuſion of blood at every coronation of a new emperor. It was the cuſtom, that when the emperor drew near to Rome in order to be crowned, the pope entrenched himſelf, the people ſtood upon their guard, and all Italy was up in arms. The emperor then promiſed that he would attempt nothing againſt the life, the perſon, nor the honour of the pope, the cardinals nor the magiſtrates. A knight, compleatly armed, took his oath upon the croſs, in the name of Frederic. The pope then went to meet the emperor ſome miles from Rome; the Roman ceremonial required that the emperor ſhould proſtrate himſelf before the pope and kiſs his feet, hold his ſtirrup, and lead the holy father's white palfrey by the bridle the diſtance of nine Roman paces. It was not thus, however, that the popes uſed to receive Charlemagne. Frederic looked upon this ceremony as an inſult, and refuſed to ſubmit to it: upon this refuſal all the cardinals fled, as if this prince had been guilty of a ſacrilege, which was the ſignal of a civil war. But the Roman chancery, which kept a regiſter of every thing of this kind, made him ſenſible that his predeceſſors had always complied with theſe ceremonies. I queſtion whether any other emperor but Lotharius II. ſucceſſor to Henry V. had led the pope's horſe by the bridle. The ceremony of kiſſing his feet, which was the eſtabliſhed cuſtom, did not hurt Frederic's pride; but he could not bear that of holding the ſtirrup and the bridle, looking upon it as an innovation. However, his pride at length digeſted theſe two ſuppoſed affronts, which he conſtrued only as empty marks of chriſtian humility, but which the

the court of Rome reckoned as proofs of real ſubjection.

The deputies of the Roman people were grown ſo inſolent, ſince almoſt all the other cities of Italy had rung the alarm of liberty, that they wanted to ſtipulate on their ſide with the emperor; but upon beginning their harangue in theſe terms: "Great king, we have made you our fellow-citizen and our prince, of a foreigner that you was before." The emperor, wearied out with ſuch repeated inſolencies, ſilenced them, and told them in plain terms: "Rome is no longer what ſhe was; nor is it true that it is you who have called me to be your prince. Charlemagne and Otho conquered you by their valour, and I am your maſter by right of poſſeſſion." With theſe words he ſent them back, and was inaugurated without the walls of the city by the pope, who put the ſceptre into his hand, and the crown on his head. June 18, 1155.

At that time they knew ſo little of what the empire really was, and their ſeveral pretenſions were ſo contradictory to each other, that on the one hand the Roman people mutinied, and there was a great deal of blood ſpilt, becauſe the pope had crowned the emperor without the conſent of the ſenate and the people; and on the other hand, pope Adrian, by all his letters, declared that he had conferred the benefice of the Roman empire on Frederic; "*Beneficium imperii Romani:*" this word *beneficium* literally ſignified a fief. Moreover, he publicly exhibited in Rome a picture of the emperor Lotharius II. on his knees before pope Alexander II. holding both his hands joined between thoſe of the pontiff, which was the diſtinguiſhing mark of vaſſalage; and on it was this inſcription:

Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores:
Poſt homo fit papæ, ſumit quo dante coronam.

"The king appears at the gate and ſwears to maintain the honour of Rome, and he becomes the pope's vaſſal, who grants him the crown."

Frederic, who was then at Beſançon*, hearing theſe proceedings, and having expreſſed his diſpleaſure at them, a cardinal then preſent made anſwer, "Of whom then does he hold the empire but of the pope?" Otho, count Palatine, was ſo enraged at this inſolent ſpeech, that he was very near running him through the body with the imperial ſword, which he held in his hand. The cardinal immediately fled, and the pope entered into a treaty. The Germans at that time cut all diſputes ſhort with the ſword; and the court of Rome ſheltered itſelf in the ambiguity of its expreſſions.

Roger, conqueror of the Muſſulmans in Sicily, and of the Chriſtians in Naples, had obtained the inveſtiture of thoſe countries by kiſſing the feet of pope Urban II. who reduced the ſervice or duty to ſix hundred gold *beſants* or *ſquifates*, a coin in value about a piſtole. Pope Adrian IV. when beſieged by William in 1156, gave up to him ſeveral eccleſiaſtical pretenſions. He even conſented, that this iſland ſhould never have any legate, nor be ſubject to an appeal to the ſee of Rome, except when the king pleaſed. Ever ſince which time the kings of Sicily, though the only princes that are vaſſals of the pope, are as it were popes themſelves in that iſland. The Roman pontiffs, thus adored and abuſed, ſomewhat reſembled, if I may dare uſe the expreſſion, the idols which the Indians beat to obtain favours from them.

Adrian however fully revenged himſelf upon other kings who ſtood in need of him. He wrote thus to king Henry II. of England: "There is no doubt, and you know it very well, that Ireland, and all the iſlands which have received the faith, appertain to the church of Rome: now, if you want to take poſſeſſion of that iſland, in order to baniſh vice from thence, to enforce an obſervance of the laws, and with an intent of paying the yearly tribute of St. Peter's penny for

* In the Franche Comté, as it is now called, a part of the kingdom of Burgundy, which had devolved to Frederic by marriage.

for every houſe, we with pleaſure grant you your requeſt."

If I may be allowed to make ſome reflections in this hiſtorical eſſay of the world, I cannot help obſerving that it is very ſtrangely governed. An Engliſh beggar, become biſhop of Rome, beſtows Ireland by his own authority, on a man who wants to uſurp it. The popes had carried on more than one war about the inveſtiture by the croſier and ring; and Adrian ſends Henry II. a ring as a mark of the inveſtiture of Ireland. If a king had given a ring upon conferring a prebendary, he would have been guilty of ſacrilege.

The intrepid activity of Frederic Barbaroſſa was but barely able to ſubdue the popes who diſputed the empire, Rome who refuſed to acknowledge a maſter, and all the cities of Italy who ſtood up for their liberty. He had at the ſame time the Bohemians to repreſs, who had mutinied againſt him, and the Poles with whom he was at war; yet all this did he effect. He conquered Poland, and erected it into a tributary kingdom. He quelled the tumults in Bohemia, 1158
which had already been erected into a kingdom by Henry IV. in 1086; and it is ſaid that the king of Denmark received the inveſtiture of his dominions from him. He ſecured the fidelity of the princes of the empire by rendering himſelf formidable to foreign nations, and flew back to Italy, who founded her hopes of liberty on the troubles and perplexities of this prince. On his arrival he found every thing in confuſion, not ſo much from the efforts of the ſeveral cities to recover their liberty, as from that party fury, which, as I have already obſerved, conſtantly prevailed at the elections of popes.

Adrian IV. dying, two oppoſite factions
tumultuouſly elected the two perſons known 1160
by the names of Victor II. and Alexander III.
The emperor's allies neceſſarily acknowledged the pope choſen by him; and the princes, who were jealous of the emperor, acknowledged the other. What was the ſhame and ſcandal of Rome, then became the ſignal of diviſion over all Europe. Victor II. Frederic's pope,

had Germany, Bohemia, and the one half of Italy on his ſide: the reſt ſubmitted to Alexander, in honour of whom the Milaneſe, who were avowed enemies to the emperor, built the city of Alexandria. In vain did thoſe of Frederic's party endeavour to have it named Cæſarea; the pope's name prevailed, and it was called *Aleſſandria de la paglia* *, a ſurname which ſhews the difference between this little city, and others of that name formerly built in honour of the true Alexander.

Happy would it have been for the age, had it produced no other diſputes; but Milan, for attempting to regain its liberty, was, by the emperor's or-
1162 ders, razed to the foundations, and ſalt ſtrewed upon its ruins. Breſcia and Placentia were diſmantled by the conqueror, and the other cities who had aſpired at liberty were deprived of their privileges. But pope Alexander, who had ſtirred them all up to revolt, returned to Rome after the death of his rival; and at his return renewed the civil war. Frederic cauſed another pope to be elected, and this dying likewiſe he nominated a third. Then Alexander III. fled over to France, the natural aſylum of every pope who was an enemy to the emperor; but the flames of diſcord he had raiſed continued to rage in their full force. The cities of Italy united together in defence of their liberty, and the Milaneſe rebuilt their city, in ſpite of the emperor. At length the pope by negotiating proved ſtronger than the emperor by fighting; and Frederic Barbaroſſa found himſelf obliged to give way. Venice had the honour of being the place of reconciliation.
1177 The emperor, the pope, and a great number of princes and cardinals repaired to this city, already become miſtreſs of the ſea, and one of the wonders of the world: the emperor there put an end to the diſpute by acknowledging the pope, kiſſing his feet, and holding his ſtirrup on the ſea-ſhore. All the advantage was

* Or, *Alexandria built of Straw*, on account of the meanneſs of its buildings and fortifications, ſo denominated in deriſion by the emperor Barbaroſſa.

was on the ſide of the church. Frederic promiſed to reſtore all that belonged to the ſee of Rome; but ſtill the lands of the counteſs Matilda were not ſo much as mentioned. The emperor made a truce for ſix years, with the cities of Italy: Milan, now rebuilt, with Pavia, Breſcia, and many other towns, thanked the pope for having reſtored to them that precious liberty for which they had been fighting; and the holy father, in a tranſport of joy, exclaimed, "God has been pleaſed to permit an old man, and a prieſt, to triumph, without the aſſiſtance of arms, over a powerful and formidable emperor."

It is very remarkable, that during theſe long quarrels, though pope Alexander had often performed the ceremony of excommunicating the emperor, he never went ſo far as to depoſe him. This behaviour is not only a proof of this pontiff's great prudence, but likewiſe a general condemnation of the extravagance of Gregory VII.

All things being quiet in Italy, Frederic ſet out for the holy wars, where he loſt his life by bathing in the Cydnus, being ſeized with the ſame diſorder as that which Alexander the Great had formerly with great difficulty recovered from, when he plunged himſelf, while in a ſweat, into that river. Probably this illneſs was a pleuriſy. 1190

Frederic had carried his pretenſions farther than any other emperor before him had done; he had cauſed a decree to be made by the doctors of the law at Bologna, in 1158, ſetting forth, that the empire of the whole world of right belonged to him, and that to maintain the contrary was hereſy. But there was ſomething more real in the oath of allegiance which the ſenate and people of Rome ſwore to him at his coronation, which however became of none effect, after pope Alexander III. had got the better of him at the congreſs of Venice. Iſaac Angelus, emperor of Conſtantinople, gave him no other title than that of the church of Rome's lawyer; and certainly Rome uſed her laywer as ill as poſſible.

As

As to pope Alexander, he lived four years longer in a glorious tranquillity, the darling of Rome, and of all Italy. He enacted, in a numerous council, that, for the future, it ſhould be ſufficient to have two-thirds of the cardinal's votes only, to declare a pope duly elected: and yet this regulation could not prevent the ſchiſms, which were afterwards cauſed by what they call in Italy *la rabbia papale* *.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Of the Emperor HENRY VI. and of ROME.

THE diſputes between Rome and the empire ſtill continued to ſubſiſt, with a greater or leſs degree of rancour. Writers tell us, that when
1191 Henry VI. ſon to the emperor Frederic Barbaroſſa, kneeled down to receive the imperial crown at the hands of old pope Celeſtine III. who was upwards of eighty, that haughty pontiff, with a ſtroke of his foot, kicked the crown off the emperor's head. This is a very improbable fact; but it is enough that it gained credit, to ſhew to what length party animoſities were carried. If the pope had really behaved in this manner, it would have been only an act of weakneſs.

But the crowning of Henry VI. furniſhed matters of far greater concern. This prince wanted to have poſſeſſion of the two Sicilies; and, in order to obtain it, condeſcended, though an emperor, to receive from the pope the inveſtiture of thoſe very ſtates which had originally paid homage to the empire, and of which he at the ſame time looked upon himſelf as hereditary proprietor, and lord-paramount. He demands of the pope to be received as his liege-vaſſal, and the pope refuſes him. The

* The papal madneſs.

The Romans were not willing to accept him for a neighbour, nor the Neapolitans for a maſter; but he made himſelf ſo in ſpite of them. The princeſs Conſtance, daughter to king William II. was the only one remaining of the lawful line of the Norman conquerors, and ſhe was married to this Henry VI. Tancred, a baſtard of that line, had been acknowledged king by the people and the ſee of Rome. The diſpute then was, who ſhould wear the crown, Tancred who poſſeſſed it by right of election, or Henry who claimed in right of his wife? This was to be decided by arms; and the Sicilians in vain, after the death of Tancred, proclaimed his young ſon: Henry's fortune 1193 prevailed; and one of the baſeſt acts that a ſovereign could be guilty of, proved the means of his ſucceſſes.

The intrepid king of England, Richard *cœur de lion*, in returning from a cruſade, was caſt away near the coaſt of Dalmatia: he enters the territories of the duke of Auſtria. This prince violates 1194 the laws of hoſpitality, loads the king of England with chains, and afterwards ſells him to the emperor, as the Arabs do their ſlaves. Henry gets a large ſum for his ranſom *, and with this money he makes the conqueſt of the two Sicilies: he then cauſes the body of king Tancred to be taken out of his grave; and, by an act of barbarity equally idle and execrable, orders the head to be ſevered from the lifeleſs trunk by the hands of the executioner. The young prince, ſon to Tancred, has his eyes put out, is caſtrated, and afterwards confined in a dungeon at Coira, a town in the country of the Griſons. His mother and his ſiſters are ſhut up in Alſace, all the friends of this unhappy family, of whatſoever rank or degree, are put to death by tortures, and the royal treaſures are carried away into Germany.

Thus did the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily paſs to Germans, after having been conquered by Frenchmen; and

* His ranſom was fixed in the diet of Worms, at one hundred and fifty thouſand marks of ſilver.

and thus did twenty provinces fall under the dominion of princes whom nature had placed at three hundred leagues diſtance from them: an eternal ſubject of diſcord, and a proof of the wiſdom of the *Salique* law, a law which would be ſtill more advantageous to a ſmall ſtate than to a large one. Henry VI. was at that time much more powerful than his father Frederic Barbaroſſa had been; he was in a manner deſpotic in Germany, he was ſovereign of Lombardy, Naples, and Sicily, and lord-paramount at Rome, where he made all tremble. But his cruelty proved his deſtruction; for it is ſaid that his own wife Conſtance, whoſe family he had ſo barbarouſly exterminated, conſpired againſt
1198 the tyrant, and took him off by poiſon.

Upon the death of Henry VI. the empire of Germany was divided. This was not the caſe of France; its kings having been either prudent or fortunate enough to ſettle the order of ſucceſſion. But the imperial title affected by Germany, had proved the means of making the crown elective. Every biſhop, or great lord, had a right to give his vote. This right of electing, and being elected, flattered the ambition of princes, and not unfrequently cauſed many ills to the ſtate.

Young Frederic II. ſon to Henry VI. was
1198 but juſt out of his cradle, when he was elected emperor by a faction, and gave the title of *King of the Romans* to his uncle Philip. Another party choſe Otho of Saxony. The popes reaped an advantage from theſe troubles in Germany of a different nature to what the emperors had done by thoſe in Italy.

Innocent III. the ſon of a gentleman of Agnani, in the neighbourhood of Rome, built the edifice of that temporal power, the materials of which his predeceſſors had been amaſſing during the ſpace of 400 years. The excommunicating of Philip, the attempting to dethrone young Frederic, the pretending to exclude for ever from the throne of Germany and Italy the houſe of Suabia, ſo odious to the popes, and the ſetting themſelves

ſelves up for the judges of kings, was become the common language ſince the time of Gregory VII. But Innocent III. did not ſtop at theſe trifling ceremonies: a fair opportunity offered, which he readily embraced, of obtaining the patrimony of St. Peter, which had been ſo long conteſted, and which was a part of the inheritance of the famous counteſs Matilda.

He now ſaw himſelf acknowledged as ſovereign in Romagnia, Umbria, the Marche of Ancona, Orbitello, and Viterbo; in ſhort, his dominion extended from ſea to ſea. The Romans had not carried their conqueſts farther in the four firſt ages of their republic, nor were theſe countries of ſuch value to them as they were to the popes. Innocent III. conquered even Rome itſelf; and the new ſenate, no longer that of Rome, but the pope's, bowed at his nod. He alſo aboliſhed the title of conſul. The Roman pontiffs now began to be kings indeed; and religion concurring with the times, made them likewiſe the maſters of kings. But this great temporal power in Italy was not of long duration.

Hiſtory does not furniſh us with any thing more intereſting than what paſſed at this time between the heads of the church, France, Germany, and England. Rome was always the maſter-ſpring that gave motion to the affairs of Europe. We have ſeen the diſputes between the prieſthood and the empire down to pope Innocent III. and to the emperors Philip, Henry, and Otho, while Frederic II. was yet in his minority. We muſt now caſt our eyes upon France, and the intereſts which thoſe kingdoms had to diſpute with Germany.

CHAP.

CHAP. XL.

The State of FRANCE and ENGLAND, 'till the Reigns of ST. LEWIS, JOHN LACKLAND, and HENRY III. during the twelfth Century. Great Changes in the public Adminiſtration in ENGLAND and FRANCE. The Murder of THOMAS BECKET, Archbiſhop of CANTERBURY: ENGLAND made a Fief to the See of ROME, &c.

THE feudal government was eſtabliſhed almoſt all over Europe, and the laws of chivalry were every where the ſame: in France in particular it was eſtabliſhed, that if the lord of a fief ſaid to his liege-man, "Come along with me, for I want to wage war againſt the king my ſovereign, who refuſes to do me juſtice;" the liege-man was immediately to go to the king, and aſk him if it was true that he had refuſed to do juſtice to ſuch a lord. If the king did refuſe it, the liege-man was obliged to join his lord, and to march with him againſt the king the limited number of days, or loſe his fief: ſuch a regulation might not improperly be termed, *An ordinance for waging civil war*.

King Lewis the Fat was almoſt always employed in waging war with his barons, within ſeven or eight leagues of Paris.

Lewis the Young had acquired very large demeſnes by marriage, but he loſt them all again by a divorce. He had received affronts from his wife Eleonora, who was heireſs of Guienne and Poitou, that a great king ſhould have overlooked. Tired with accompanying him in theſe famous and unfortunate cruſades in which he was engaged, ſhe had made herſelf amends, to uſe her own expreſſion, for the tedious hours ſhe was obliged to ſpend with a king who was fitter to be a monk. This coming to the king's knowledge, he annulled his marriage, under pretence of conſanguinity. Lewis has been blam-

ed

ed by ſome for not keeping his wife's dowry, when he put her away; but ſuch ſhould conſider, that a king of France was not powerful enough at that time to commit ſuch an act of injuſtice.

Henry II. afterwards king of England, a deſcendent of William the Conqueror, and already poſſeſſed of Normandy, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine, was leſs difficult than Lewis the Young, and thought it no diſgrace to marry a gay lady who brought him the countries of Guienne and Poitou for her dowry. Soon after he was raiſed to the throne of England, and paid homage for thoſe territories to the king of France, who would have been glad to have paid it to him for the ſame poſſeſſions.

The feudal government was equally diſagreeable to the kings of France, England, and Germany; and theſe princes undertook, almoſt at the ſame time, and by the ſame means, to raiſe troops independent of their vaſſals. King Lewis granted certain privileges to all the towns in his demeſnes, on condition that each pariſh ſhould repair to the army under the banner of the ſaint of their parochial church, in like manner as the kings themſelves marched under the banner of St. Denis. Several bondmen were enfranchiſed at this time and made citizens, and the citizens had the privilege of chuſing their municipal officers, their ſheriffs, and their mayors.

We may date the epocha of this re-eſtabliſhment of the municipal government of the cities and boroughs, about the years 1137 and 1138. Henry II. of England granted the like privileges to ſeveral cities for a certain ſum, which he employed in raiſing troops.

The emperors followed much the ſame method in Germany. The city of Spires, for example, purchaſed in 1166 the privilege of chuſing their own burgomaſters, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of their biſhop. Thus liberty, the natural privilege of mankind, aroſe from the indigence of princes: but this liberty was but a leſſer degree of ſervitude, compared with that enjoyed by the cities of Italy, who had then erected themſelves into republics.

The

The inhabitants of Upper Italy had formed a plan of government upon that of antient Greece: moſt of theſe great cities having recovered their liberty, and being united in one common cauſe, ſeemed to bid fair to become a formidable republic; but they were quickly deſtroyed by great and little tyrants.

The popes had each of theſe cities to manage, together with the kingdoms of Naples, Germany, France, England, and Spain, with all which they had ſome diſputes, and always came off with the advantage.

King Lewis the Young, having, in 1142, excluded one of his ſubjects, named Peter la Chartre, from being made biſhop of Bourges, this man was choſen in ſpite of him; and, being ſupported by the ſee of Rome, he laid all the king's demeſnes within his biſhopric under an interdict: this occaſioned a civil war, which continued till the king, by a treaty, acknowledged the biſhop, and intreated the pope to take off the interdict.

The kings of England were engaged in ſtill greater broils with the church; one of theſe kings, whoſe memory is moſt revered by the Engliſh, is Henry I. the third king from the Conqueſt, who began his reign in 1100. The Engliſh have him in grateful remembrance for eaſing them of the curfeu-law, which had ſo long been a reſtraint to them. He, like a wiſe legiſlator, ſettled one ſtandard for weights and meaſures throughout all his kingdom; a regulation which was eaſily executed in England, tho' it has been ſo often unſucceſsfully propoſed in France. This prince likewiſe confirmed the laws of Edward the Confeſſor, which had been abrogated by his father William the Conqueror. In fine, to engage the clergy in his intereſts, he renounced the right of *regale*, which gave him the uſufruct of all vacant benefices, a right which the kings of France have always preſerved.

But beſides all this he ſigned a charter of privileges, which he granted to the Engliſh nation, and which was the original ſource of thoſe liberties which afterwards became

became ſo greatly enlarged †. William the Conqueror had treated the Engliſh like ſlaves, whom he did not fear. Henry, his ſon, behaved more kindly to them, but it was becauſe he ſtood in need of them. He was a younger brother, and had wreſted the ſceptre from his elder brother, Robert. This was the true cauſe of that great indulgence he ſhewed to- 1103
wards his ſubjects. But artful and abſolute as he was, he could not prevent his own clergy and the ſee of Rome from oppoſing theſe inveſtitures; and therefore found himſelf obliged to deſiſt, and content himſelf with the homage paid him by the biſhops for their temporalities.

As for France it was exempt from theſe troubles; the ceremony of the croſier and ring being not yet introduced into that kingdom.

The Engliſh biſhops at that time were little leſs than temporal princes in their own dioceſes: at leaſt they were equal in power and riches to the greateſt vaſſals of the crown. Under the reign of king Stephen, ſucceſſor to Henry I. a biſhop of Saliſbury, named Roger, who was married, and lived publicly with the woman he owned for his wife, made war againſt his ſovereign. In the courſe of this war one of his caſtles being taken, it is ſaid there were found therein four thouſand marks of ſilver; which, reckoning eight ounces to the mark, amount to two millions of livres of the preſent money of France. An incredible ſum at a time when ſpecie was ſo ſcarce, and commerce ſo greatly limited.

After the reign of this Stephen, which was continually diſturbed by civil wars, England put on a new face under Henry II. who united under his dominion Normandy, Anjou, Touraine, Saintonge, Guienne, and Poitou, with all England, excepting only the county of Cornwal, which was not then conquered

† He confirmed the privileges they had formerly enjoyed; and redreſſed the grievances which had been introduced after the Conqueſt.

quered *. The whole kingdom now enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, when the public happineſs was diſturbed by the great diſpute between the king and Thomas Becket, commonly called St. Thomas of Canterbury.

This Becket was a lawyer. He had been raiſed by Henry II. to the dignity of chancellor, and afterwards to that of archbiſhop of Canterbury, primate of England, and legate of the holy ſee. But no ſooner was he made the ſecond perſon in the kingdom, than he became an enemy to the firſt. A prieſt having committed a murder, the primate ordered him only to be deprived of his living. The king expreſſed his diſpleaſure at this partiality. He obſerved to him, that if a layman had been guilty of ſuch a crime he would have been puniſhed with death; and that it was encouraging the clergy to commit murder, in making the puniſhment ſo diſproportionate to the crime. The archbiſhop on his part maintained that no eccleſiaſtic could be puniſhed with death, and ſent the king back his patent for chancellor, to ſhew that he would be entirely independent. The king upon this called a parliament, where it was propoſed that no biſhop ſhould for the future be permitted to go to Rome; nor any of the king's ſubjects allowed to appeal to that ſee; nor any of his vaſſals or officers to be excommunicated or ſuſpended from their functions, without the permiſſion of the ſovereign; and laſtly, that all crimes committed by the clergy ſhould be cognizable by the ordinary courts of juſtice. This motion was paſſed by all the temporal peers; but Thomas Becket at firſt refuſed his aſſent: however, he at length ſigned theſe juſt and ſalutary laws †; but afterwards made his excuſes to the pope, for having, as he ſaid, betrayed the rights of the church, and promiſed never to be guilty of the like conceſſions.

Being

* The author's meaning in this place is not eaſily underſtood. Cornwal had been long ſubject to the king of England. The conqueſt of Wales indeed Henry undertook.

† Called the Conſtitutions of Clarendon, from the place where they were enacted.

Being accuſed by the peers of miſdemeanors during the time of his chancellorſhip, he refuſed to make his defence, becauſe he was an archbiſhop; upon which he was condemned by the lords ſpiritual and temporal, to be impriſoned as a ſeditious perſon; he then fled over to France, and repaired to the court of Lewis the Young, the hereditary enemy of Henry II. The king of England uſed every gentle and humane method to engage the archbiſhop to return to his duty; and in a voyage he made to France, he took Lewis the Young, his lord-paramount, for arbiter, to whom he expreſſed himſelf in theſe terms: "Let the archbiſhop act towards me as the holieſt of his predeceſſors has behaved towards the loweſt of mine, and I ſhall be ſatisfied." At length a feigned reconciliation was made between the king and the primate.

Becket now returned to England; but it was only to excommunicate all the clergy, biſhops, canons, and curates, who had voted againſt him. Theſe made their complaints in a body to the king, who was then in Normandy; and Henry's paſſion being raiſed to the higheſt pitch, he cried out, "Is there none of my ſervants then that will rid me of this turbulent prieſt?" 1170

Theſe words were certainly highly indiſcreet, and ſeemed to put the poniard into the hand of any aſſaſſin, who thought to ſerve the king by murdering a perſon who ought to have been puniſhed only by the laws.

Accordingly four ſervants of the king's houſhold went directly to Canterbury, where they murdered an archbiſhop at the foot of the altar. Thus a perſon who deſerved to be proceeded againſt as a rebel, became a martyr, and the king was loaded with all the infamy and horror of this murder. 1170

Hiſtory does not take notice of any puniſhment being inflicted on theſe four aſſaſſins *. It appears that the king was the only perſon who ſuffered for it.

We

* They ſubmitted to the pope's judgment, repaired to Rome, and were ordered to make a pilgrimage to Jeruſalem.

We have already ſeen how pope Adrian IV. gave Henry II. permiſſion to uſurp Ireland. Pope Alexander III. ſucceſſor of Adrian, confirmed this permiſſion, on condition that the king ſhould ſwear that he had never commanded this murder; and that he ſhould repair bare-footed to the archbiſhop's tomb, and there receive diſcipline by the hands of the canons of the church of Canterbury. It would have been a great act to diſpoſe of Ireland, ſuppoſing Henry to have had a right to take poſſeſſion of it, and the pope to beſtow it; but it was greater ſtill to oblige a king powerful like Henry, to acknowledge his fault, and aſk pardon for it.

The king, whoſe children had revolted
1177 againſt him, finiſhed his penance, after he had compleated the conqueſt of Ireland. He made a ſolemn renunciation of all the regal rights which he had maintained againſt Becket. The Engliſh condemn their king for this act of renunciation, as likewiſe for ſubmitting to the penance. He doubtleſs ought not to have ſo eaſily given up his rights; but he ought to have repented being acceſſary to murder‡: the intereſts of mankind require that there ſhould be a curb to reſtrain ſovereigns, and ſecure the lives and liberties of the ſubject. This curb of religion might by univerſal agreement be lodged in the hands of the popes, as we have already obſerved; and the firſt pontiff by engaging in temporal quarrels only with a view to appeaſe them, by admoniſhing both princes and people of their reſpective duties, and reproving them for their faults, reſerving the thunder of excommunication for the puniſhment of the more atrocious crimes: by this behaviour I ſay, the popes might have made themſelves regarded as the expreſs images

‡ He was by no means guilty of the aſſaſſination; for though in the firſt tranſports of his paſſion he exclaimed, "That if he had friends about him, he ſhould not have been ſo long expoſed to the inſults of a babbling prieſt," (and even this circumſtance is diſputed) he no ſooner underſtood that four of his knights had privately departed, than, ſuſpecting their deſign, he diſpatched meſſengers to overtake, and charge them, in his name, that they ſhould commit no violence.

images of God upon earth; but as it is, mankind are obliged to depend for their ſafety on the laws and manners of each country: the former of which are too often deſpiſed, and the latter corrupted.

England enjoyed full tranquillity under Richard Cœur-de-Lion, the ſon and ſucceſſor of Henry II. This prince was unſucceſsful in his cruſades, but his country was not unhappy §. He had indeed ſome of thoſe diſputes with Philip Auguſtus, which are unavoidable between a lord-paramount and a potent vaſſal. But theſe did in no wiſe change the face of affairs in either kingdom. We ſhould look upon theſe kind of wars between Chriſtian princes as epidemic diſeaſes, which, though they may depopulate ſome provinces, make no alteration in the bounds, cuſtoms, or manners of a country. The moſt remarkable thing which fell out during theſe wars was Richard's taking from Philip his chancery, which he always carried with him, containing an account of his revenues and vaſſals, and a liſt of his ſlaves and freemen. After the loſs of this regiſter, the king of France was obliged to make a new one, in which his prerogative was rather increaſed than diminiſhed.

Another event worthy of attention is, the impriſonment of a biſhop of Beauvais, who was taken in arms by king Richard. Pope Celeſtine ſent to Richard, reclaiming the biſhop, with theſe words: "You muſt reſtore me my ſon." But the king ſent the biſhop's armour to the pope, with this anſwer, taken from the ſtory of Joſeph: "Know-eſt thou thy ſon's garment?" 1194

We muſt further obſerve in relation to this church warriour, that if the feudal laws did not compel the biſhops themſelves to take up arms, they at leaſt obliged them to bring their vaſſals to the place appointed for the rendezvous of the army.

Philip Auguſtus ſeized upon the temporalities of the biſhops of Orleans and Auxerre; for not having complied with

§ It was as unhappy as a nation could be, in being drained of its men and money; and indeed utterly impoveriſhed by raiſing money to pay the king's ranſom.

with this abuſe, now become a duty. The biſhops, upon being condemned, began by laying the kingdom under an interdict, and finiſhed by aſking pardon.

We ſhall meet with other adventures of Richard Cœur-de-Lion, in the courſe of the cruſades. John Lackland his brother, who ſucceeded him, might have been the greateſt prince in Europe; for beſides the demeſnes left him by his father Henry II. he had alſo Brittany, which he uſurped from his nephew, prince Arthur, to whom this province had devolved in right of his mother. But by endeavouring to take what did not belong to him, he loſt all he had, and became an example of terror to all bad princes. He began by ſeizing on the kingdom of Brittany, which, as I have before ſaid, belonged to his nephew Arthur, whom he took priſoner in an engagement, and confined in the caſtle of Rouen; nor was it ever known what became of this young prince. John has been accuſed by all Europe, and indeed not without reaſon, of having made away with him. Happily for the inſtruction of all kings, this crime is known to have been the firſt cauſe of all his misfortunes.

The feudal laws, which in other places gave birth to ſo many diſorders, here ſignalized themſelves by an act of memorable juſtice. The counteſs of Brittany, mother to prince Arthur, preſented a petition to the court of peers in France, ſigned by all the barons of Brittany; in conſequence of which the king of England was ſummoned to appear before his peers. This ſummons was ſerved upon him at London, by the ſerjeant at arms. The accuſed king ſent over a biſhop to France to demand of Philip a ſafe-conduct for his perſon. "Let him come, replied Philip, he is free to do it." "Shall he have ſecurity for his ſafe return? ſaid the biſhop. "Yes, reſumed the king, if the judgment of his peers permit it." But John not appearing, the peers of France paſſed ſen-
1103 tence of death upon him, and declared all his territories ſituated in France to be forfeited to the king. Philip loſt no time in putting himſelf in a condition to profit by the crime of the king

king his vaſſal. John ſeems to have been, like moſt tyrannical kings, of a cowardly diſpoſition; he ſuffered himſelf to be ſtripped of Normandy, Guienne, and Poitou, and retired to England, where he was equally hated and deſpiſed. For ſome time he found a reſource in the native pride and haughtineſs of the Engliſh nation, who could not bear the thoughts of their king being condemned by a court in France: but the barons of England ſoon grew weary of ſupplying a king with money, who did not know how to make uſe of it. To compleat his misfortunes, John embroiled himſelf with the court of Rome about an archbiſhop of Canterbury, whom pope Innocent III. wanted to nominate of his own authority, in oppoſition to the laws of the country. This pope, under whom the holy ſee became ſo formidable, laid the kingdom of England under an interdict, and forbad John's ſubjects from paying him any obedience for the future. This eccleſiaſtical thunderbolt was at this time truly terrible; becauſe, the pope put it into the hands of Philip Auguſtus to whom he made over the kingdom of England in perpetual inheritance, promiſing him the remiſſion of all his ſins if he ſucceeded in conquering it. He even granted the ſame indulgences for this expedition as had been given to thoſe who went to recover the Holy Land. The king of France did not now think proper to declare that the popes had no right to diſpoſe of crowns: he had himſelf been excommunicated ſome years before †, and his kingdom laid under an interdict by this very pope Innocent III. for having attempted to marry another wife. He had then publicly declared the papal cenſures to be inſolent and abuſive; and had ſeized on the temporalities of every biſhop and prieſt in the kingdom, who had ſhewed himſelf ſo bad a Frenchman as to pay obedience to the pope. But he thought quite differently when he ſaw himſelf commiſſioned by a bull to take poſſeſſion of England. He now took back his wife, for divorcing whom he had 1212

† In the year 1199.

had incurred ſo many excommunications, and thought of nothing but putting the pope's ſentence in execution. He employed a whole year in building a fleet of 1700 ſhips, and raiſing the fineſt army that had ever been ſeen in France.

The hatred, which the Engliſh bore to king John, was equivalent to another army in favour of king Philip, who now prepared to ſet out on his expedition, while John on his ſide made a laſt effort to receive him in a proper manner; and, hated as he was by the greater part of the nation, he found means, through the emulation that perpetually ſubſiſts between the Engliſh and the French, the indignation of the former at the pope's behaviour, and the prerogatives annexed to the crown, which are of no ſmall weight, to keep on foot for a few weeks an army of 60,000 men, at the head of which he advanced as far as Dover, to receive the perſon who had condemned him in France, and was come to dethrone him in England.

All Europe now waited with impatience for a deciſive battle between the two kings, when the pope tricked them both, and artfully took that to himſelf which he had pretended to beſtow on Philip. This extraordinary negotiation was carried on and concluded by one Pandolfo, a ſubdeacon; a domeſtic of the pope's, and his legate in France and England. This man went over to Dover, under pretence of negotiating matters with the Engliſh barons in favour of the French king. Here he ſaw king John, to
1213 whom he took an opportunity of ſpeaking in theſe terms: "You are undone, ſir, the French fleet is going to ſet ſail; your troops will certainly deſert you; ſo you have only one reſource left, which is to put yourſelf under the protection of the holy ſee." John conſented to this propoſal, ſwore to ſubmit himſelf, and ſixteen barons took the ſame oath on the king's ſoul. A ſtrange oath! by which they obliged themſelves to the performance of conditions they did not know. The artful Italian ſo intimidated the king, and ſo worked upon the barons, that at length, on the 15th of May 1213, in the houſe

houſe of the knights templars, in the ſuburb of Dover, king John kneeling down, and holding his hands between thoſe of the legate, pronounced the following words:

"I John, by the grace of God, king of England and lord of Ireland, for the expiation of my ſins, and out of my pure free will, and with the advice of my barons, do give unto the church of Rome, and to pope Innocent and his ſucceſſors, the kingdoms of England and Ireland, together with all the rights belonging to them; and will hold them of the pope as his vaſſal; I will be faithful to God, to the church of Rome, to the pope my lord, and to his ſucceſſors lawfully elected: and I bind myſelf to pay him a tribute of one thouſand marks of ſilver yearly, to wit, ſeven hundred for the kingdom of England, and three hundred for Ireland."

The money was then put into the legate's hands, as the firſt payment of the tribute; after which the crown and ſceptre were likewiſe given to him. The Italian deacon trode the money under his feet, but he kept the crown and ſceptre five days; at the end of which he returned them to the king, as a favour from the pope their common maſter.

Philip Auguſtus was all this time waiting at Boulogne for the legate's return, in order to put to ſea. The legate at length came back to let him know that he was no longer permitted to attack England, which was become a fief of the church of Rome, and its king taken under the protection of the holy ſee.

The donation which the pope had made to Philip of the kingdom of England, was now likely to become of fatal conſequence to him; for another excommunicated prince, nephew to king John, had entered into an alliance with his uncle, to oppoſe the deſigns of France, who began now to be too formidable. This excommunicated perſon was the emperor Otho IV. who at once diſputed the empire with young Frederic II. ſon to Henry VI. and Italy with the pope. He was the only emperor of Germany that had ever given battle in perſon to a king of France.

CHAP. XLI.

Of Otho IV. and Philip Augustus in the thirteenth Century. Of the battle of Bouvines, and of England and France, till the death of Lewis VII. father to St. Lewis.

Although the ſyſtem of the balance of Europe was never ſufficiently explained till of late, yet it appears to have been always a maxim to unite againſt the preponderating powers. Germany, England, and the Low Countries, now took up arms againſt Philip Auguſtus, in the ſame manner as we have in our time ſeen them join together againſt Lewis XIV. Ferrand, count of Flanders, entered into an alliance with the emperor Otho IV. This count was Philip's vaſſal; but that was the very reaſon which induced him to declare himſelf againſt him, as well as the count of Boulogne. This Philip was very near being cruſhed, for having accepted of a preſent made him by the pope. However, by his good fortune and great courage he extricated himſelf out of all theſe difficulties, with greater glory than had been acquired by any king of France before him.

Betwixt Liſle and Tournay lies a little vil-
1215 lage, called Bouvines, near to which Otho IV. at the head of an army upwards of one hundred thouſand ſtrong, advanced to attack king Philip, who had not above half that number. At that time they made uſe of the croſs-bow, a weapon which had been in uſe ever ſince the end of the twelfth century: but the fate of the day was chiefly decided by the weight of the cavalry, who were entirely clad in iron. This complete armour was a privilege of honour granted to the knights which the eſquires could not pretend to, they not being permitted to be invulnerable. All that a knight had to be

be afraid of was being wounded either in the face, when he lifted up the viſor of his helmet; or in the ſide, at the joints of the armour; or when knocked down, by having his coat of mail lifted up; or laſtly, under the arm-pit when he lifted up his arm to ſtrike.

There were alſo other troops of cavalry raiſed from among the common people; theſe were not ſo well armed as the knights. As for the infantry, they made uſe of ſuch defenſive arms as they liked beſt; their weapons of offence were the ſword, the arrow, the club, and the ſling.

Philip's army was drawn up in battalia, by a biſhop whoſe name was Guerin, and had been lately nominated to the biſhopric of Senlis. The ſame biſhop of Beauvais who had been ſo long kept priſoner by Richard Cœur-de-Lion, was alſo preſent at this battle: he always fought with a club, ſaying, that it was contrary to the canons to ſpill human blood. It is not known in what manner either the emperor or the king ranged their troops. Philip, juſt before the onſet, ordered this pſalm to be ſung: *Exſurgat Deus & diſſipentur inimici ejus.* "Let the Lord ariſe and put his enemies to flight." As if Otho had taken up arms againſt God himſelf. Before this the French were accuſtomed to ſing verſes in praiſe of Charlemagne and Roland. Otho's imperial ſtandard was carried upon four wheels: this was a long pole, to which was faſtened a painted dragon, and over the dragon was raiſed an eagle of gilt wood. The royal ſtandard of France was a gilt ſtaff with white ſilk colours, ſowed with flower-de-lis; and what had been for a long time only the fancy of painters, was now become the arms of France. The old crowns of the kings of Lombardy, of which there are very exact prints in Muratori, are ſurmounted with this ornament, which is indeed nothing elſe but the head of a ſpear, faſtened with two other pieces of crooked iron.

Beſides the royal ſtandard, Philip Auguſtus had the oriflame of St. Denis carried before him. Whenever the king was in danger, one or other of theſe ſtandards was to be raiſed or lowered. Each knight had alſo his particular ſtandard, and the great knights had other co-

lours carried before them, which they called banners. This name banner, though ſo very honourable, was nevertheleſs common to all the colours carried by the infantry, which conſiſted almoſt entirely of bondmen. The military ſhout among the French was *mon joye Saint Denis*; that of the Germans was *Kyrie eleiſon*.

One proof that the knights completely armed ran no other riſk than that of being diſmounted, and were never wounded but by the greateſt accident, is, that king Philip being thrown from his horſe, was a long time ſurrounded by the enemy, and received ſeveral blows with all kinds of weapons, without loſing a drop of blood.

It is even ſaid, that while he was upon the ground, a German ſoldier attempted ſeveral times to pierce his neck with a ſpear that had a double hook, but could not compaſs it. Not one knight was killed in this battle except William Longchamps, who was unfortunately ſlain by a ſtroke in his eye, which was given him through the viſor of his helmet.

Among the Germans were reckoned five and twenty knights bannerets, and ſeven counts of the empire, made priſoners, but not one wounded.

The emperor Otho loſt the battle, in which it is ſaid there were thirty thouſand Germans killed; but probably the number is exaggerated. We do not find that the king of France made any conqueſt in Germany after the battle of Bouvines; but he gained a great increaſe of power over his vaſſals.

The greateſt loſer by this battle was king John of England, whoſe laſt hopes ſeemed centered in the emperor Otho. This emperor died ſoon after * a true penitent. It is ſaid that he uſed to order his ſcullions to trample upon him, and to ſuffer himſelf to be ſcourged by the monks agreeable to the opinion of the princes of thoſe times, who imagined, that by ſubmitting to a trifling diſcipline they could atone for the blood of ſo many thouſands.

There is no truth in what we find mentioned by many hiſtorians, that Philip, on the very day he gained the

* In 1218.

the battle of Bouvines, received the news of another victory obtained by his ſon, afterwards Lewis VIII. over king John. On the contrary, king John had gained ſome ſmall ſucceſſes in Poitou; but deprived of the aſſiſtance of his allies, he made a truce with Philip, of which indeed he had great occaſion; for his own ſubjects were now become his greateſt enemies: he was univerſally deſpiſed by them for having made himſelf the vaſſal of Rome; and the barons obliged him to ſign that famous charter, which is called *Magna Charta*, or the charter of the liberties of England. 1215

King John thought himſelf more degraded, by being obliged by this charter to leave his ſubjects in the quiet poſſeſſion of their natural rights, than by having made himſelf the ſubject of the ſee of Rome; and complained of it as the greateſt affront offered to his dignity: yet, after all, what is there in this charter that can be ſaid to be injurious to the royal authority? for inſtance, that at the death of an earl, his eldeſt ſon, to enter into poſſeſſion of the fief, muſt pay to the king one hundred marks of ſilver, and a baron one hundred ſhillings: that none of the king's bailiffs are to take the horſes belonging to peaſants, without paying five pence a-day for each horſe. Whoever reads the charter throughout will only find that the rights of human-kind have not been ſufficiently ſecured: he will ſee that the commons, who bore the heavieſt burthen, and rendered the greateſt ſervices to the ſtate, had no ſhare in a government, which yet could never flouriſh without them. Nevertheleſs, John complained bitterly of this, and applied to the pope, his new ſovereign, for redreſs.

And now pope Innocent III. who had excommunicated the king, excommunicates the peers of England; at which they were ſo provoked, that they did the very ſame thing which the pope had done before: they offered the crown of England to the king of France. Philip Auguſtus, who had conquered Germany, and was in poſſeſſion of almoſt all king John's eſtates in France, on being called to the throne of England, acted

acted like a profound politician, and prevailed on the Engliſh to aſk his ſon Lewis for their king. In vain did the pope's legates repreſent to Philip that king John was a feudatory of the holy ſee. Lewis, who had previouſly concerted the matter with the king his father, addreſſed him thus in the preſence of the legates: "Sir, I am your vaſſal for the fiefs I hold of you in France; but it does not belong to you to determine what concerns the kingdom of England; and, if you do, I ſhall appeal to my peers."

After having made this ſpeech he ſet out for England, notwithſtanding the public prohibitions of his father, who at the ſame time ſecretly ſupplied him with men and money. Innocent III. in
1216 vain thundered out his excommunications againſt both father and ſon. The biſhops of France declared that againſt the father void. Let us obſerve, however, that they did not dare to invalidate that againſt Lewis, which was tacitly acknowledging that the popes had a right to excommunicate princes. They could not indeed well diſpute this power of the popes, becauſe they aſſumed it themſelves: but they likewiſe reſerved to themſelves the right of determining whether the pope's ſentence of excommunication was juſt or not. The princes of thoſe times were in a very wretched ſituation, by being thus continually expoſed to excommunication, both in their own kingdoms and at Rome. But the people were ſtill more unhappy: the weight of the ſentence always fell upon them, and they ſeldom failed of being ſtripped by the war.

The ſon of Philip Auguſtus was proclaimed king in London: yet he did not omit ſending ambaſſadors to plead his cauſe before the pope. This pope enjoyed the ſame honour as the Roman ſenate
1216 had formerly done, of being the judge of kings; but he died before he paſſed his definitive ſentence.

John Lackland, after wandering in his own country, from town to town, died at the ſame time in a village in the county of Norfolk. A peer of France formerly

formerly conquered England, and kept poſſeſſion of it, yet a king of France could not keep it.

Lewis VIII. was obliged, even in the life-time of Philip Auguſtus, to quit that very country which had invited him to be its king; and, inſtead of defending his acquiſition, he engaged in the cruſade then carrying on againſt the Albigenſes, who at that time were ſlaughtered by thouſands, in compliance with the decrees iſſued by the court of Rome.

Philip Auguſtus died and left his territories increaſed by the acceſſion of Normandy, Maine, and Poitou; but the reſt of the poſſeſſions belonging to England were ſtill defended by a number of powerful lords. 1223

In the reign of Lewis VIII. one part of Guienne belonged to France, and the other to England. During this reign nothing happened remarkable or important, excepting the will made by Lewis in 1225, which indeed merits ſome attention.

By this will he bequeaths an hundred ſols to each of the two thouſand lazarettos in his kingdom. Thus we may perceive, that all the Chriſtians got by the cruſades was this leprous infection: and it is natural to ſuppoſe, that the want of linen, and the naſtineſs of the people, greatly increaſed the number of theſe lepers. This name of lazarettos was not indifferently given to other hoſpitals; for we may find that by the ſame will the king bequeaths an hundred livres, current money, to two hundred hoſpitals. *(Hôtels Dieu.)*

The legacy which this ſame king left of thirty thouſand livres to his wife, the famous queen of Caſtile, amounted to fifty-four thouſand livres of the preſent money. I often inſiſt upon the particular valuation of money, becauſe I look upon it as the pulſe of a ſtate, and the ſureſt way of knowing its ſtrength. For inſtance, it is evident that Philip Auguſtus was the moſt powerful prince of his time, ſince independently of the jewels he left behind him, the ſums ſpecified in his will amounted to near nine hundred thouſand marks, of eight ounces to the mark, which is worth forty-five millions preſent money, reckoning fifty livres to the mark:

mark: but there muſt certainly be ſome miſtake in this calculation; for it is hardly probable, that a king of France, who had no other revenue than what aroſe from his private demeſnes, ſhould have been able to leave ſo large a ſum behind him. The power of all the kings of Europe at that time conſiſted in having a great number of vaſſals ready to march under their command, and not in being poſſeſſed of ſufficient riches to enſlave them.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE
AU 17
1912

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.